NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06824709 1

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT;

IN WHICH THE FINITE NATURE OF SIN IS ARGUED, ITS CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCES AS SUCH; THE NECESSITY AND NATURE OF

ATONEMENT;

AND ITS GLORIOUS CONSEQUENCES, IN THE FINAL RECONCILIATION OF ALL MEN TO HOLINESS AND HAPPINESS.

BY HOSEA BALLOU, OF BARNARD;
Ordained Pastor of the UNITED SOCIETIES *of Barnard, Woodstock, Hartland, Bethel and Bridgewater.*
AUTHOR OF A PAMPHLET, ENTITLED
"*Notes on the Parables of the New-Testament.*"

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." *St. Paul.*

"And there shall be no more death. *St. John.*

BENNINGTON, VERMONT,
PRINTED FOR EBENEZER WALBRIDGE,
BY WILLIAM HASWELL.
1811.

TO NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
144864A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1924 L

A LETTER
TO THE READER.

CHRISTIAN READER,

I KNOW it is frequently the case, when a person takes a new work in hand, he first casts his eye over the title page, and if he finds no word in it that indicates perverse sentiments; and the name, or denomination, of the author is agreeable, he may think of having patience to read it; but, being something in a hurry, passes slightly over the preface, supposing it to be of little consequence. But what sensations may have struck your mind, in reading the title of this Book, and finding it to be the intention of the author to prove the doctrine of *universal holiness* and *happiness*, through the mediation and power of atoning grace, I cannot say; however, I would invite you to read, with candor and attention, not only this letter, but the whole of the work, and make up your judgment afterwards.

Many circumstances might be mentioned, which, in their association, have induced me to write and publish the following treatise; but I can say, with propriety, that the central object was that, in which I always find the most happiness, viz. to do what I find most necessary, in order to render myself most useful to mankind.

I have, from my early youth, been much in the habit of inquiring into the things of religion, and religious sentiments; and have, for a number of years, seen, or thought I saw, great inconsistencies, in what has, for a long time, passed for orthodoxy in divinity.

The ideas, that sin is infinite, and that it deserves an infinite punishment; that the law transgressed is infinite, and inflicts an infinite penalty; and that the great

Jehovah took on himself a natural body of flesh and blood, and actually suffered death on a cross, to satisfy his infinite justice, and thereby save his creatures from endless misery, are ideas which appear to me to be unfounded in the nature of reason, and unsupported by divine revelation. Such notions have, in my opinion, served to darken the human understanding and obscure the gospel of eternal life; and have rendered, what I esteem divine revelation, a subject of discredit to thousands, who, I believe, would never have condemned the scriptures, had it not been for those gross absurdities being contended for, and the scriptures forced to bend to such significations. Christian authors and preachers have labored much to dissuade those whom they have caused to disbelieve the Christian religion, from their infidelity. But, in this case, the *salt* has lost its savor, become good for nothing, and is trodden under foot of men, who are *too sensible* to believe the unreasonable dogmas imposed on the world, either through error, or design, and sanctioned by tradition and *too inattentive* to search the scriptures faithfully and impartially, whereby they might have learned, that those errors were neither in them, nor supported by them. One particular object, therefore, in this work, is, if possible, to free the scripture doctrine of atonement from those incumbrances which have done it so much injury; and open a door, at least, for the subject to be investigated on reasonable grounds, and by fair argument.

If we admit that our Creator made us reasonable beings, we ought, of course, to believe, that all the truth which is necessary for our belief, is not only reasonable, but reducible to our understandings.

In order to come at the subject of atonement, so as to have light continually shining along the path which I intend to occupy, I found it necessary to shew my reasons for not admitting the doctrine, on the ground on which it is usually argued; to do which, I found I must, of necessity, show, that the common notion of the *infinity* of *sin* is unfounded in truth; and, of course, every consequence deducible from such an error, equal-

ly unfounded and unsupported. It may seem not a little strange, to some of my readers, that I dispute the *infinity* of the law against which sin is committed; as all unholiness must be, either in union, or disunion, with the eternal law of holiness, and divine purity. But, if the reader will take a little pains to observe particularly, it will appear plain, that no being can stand amenable to a law above his capacity. And as the creature is *finite*, in his earthly character, in which character only, he is, or can be a sinner, it is not reasonable to say, that he stands amenable to an infinite law. But as the reader will find, in this work, so much of the divine law of perfection, as the creature obtains a knowledge of, (which, in comparison to the whole, is no more than a shadow to a substance) is the law which he violates by his sin. And though we may speak of the sin of ignorance, it can amount to no more than the production of a virtuous intention thwarted by ignorance, or the same principle by which the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, gratify their various inclinations and appetites. And I do not think my reader will wish to have me prove that such sin is not infinite.

In my argument on the cause, or origin of sin, I thought it necessary to hint a little on the general idea of the subject, endeavoring to show the want of propriety in what is commonly contended for; and I have sought for the rise of unholy temptations in the constitutions of earthly and finite beings. I have endeavored, also to trace the causes and consequences of sin (as sin) so as to determine the *finite* nature of *all* which belongs to sin as *cause* and *consequence*. In any sense, in which it can be said that *God* is the *author* of *any thing whatever*, in that sense of speaking, *it cannot be sin*. And in any sense, in which any action, or event, can be said to be *endless*, in its *consequences*, *God must be considered* the *author* of it.

In all the statements which I have made of the doctrinal ideas of others, I have been careful to state no more than what I have read in authors, or heard con-

tended for in preaching, or conversation; and if I have, in any instance, done those ideas any injustice, it was not intended. The reason why I have not quoted any author, or spoken of any denomination, is, I have not felt it to be my duty, nor my inclination, to write against any name, or denomination, in the world; but my object has been, what I pray it may ever be, to contend against error, wherever I find it; and to receive truth, and support it, let it come from what quarter it may. For the sake of ease, however, in writing, I reason with my *opponent*, *opposer*, or *objector*, meaning no one in particular, but any one who uses the arguments, and states the objections, which I have endeavored to answer. It is very probable, that some may think me too ironical, and, in many instances, too severe, on what I call error. But I find it very difficult to expose error, so as to be understood by all, without carrying, in many instances, my arguments in such a form as may not be agreeable to those who believe in what I wish to correct. I confess I should have been glad to have written, on all my enquiries, so as not to have displeased any, but to have pleased all, could I have done it, & accomplished my main design; but this I was pursuaded would be difficult. I have, therefore, paid particular attention to nothing, but my main object; depending on the goodness of my reader to pardon what may be disagreeable, in manner or form, as inadvertancies.

What I have written on the subject of the *Trinity*, is mainly to show the reader in what light I view the Mediator, that my general ideas of atonement may be the easier understood. And though I think my objections and arguments, against the common idea of three distinct persons in the Godhead, who are *equal* in *power* and *glory*, to be unanswerable; yet, it was not my intention to attend to a full refutation of those ideas, as I think that has frequently been done, and well done.

The opposers of universalism have generally written and contended against the doctrine, under an entire mistaken notion of it. They have endeavored to show the

absurdity of believing that men could be received into the *kingdom* of *glory* and *righteousness, in their sins;* which *no Universalist ever believed.* In this work, I have endeavored to make as fair a statement, of what I call universalism, as I was able; and it stands on such ground, that the *propriety* of it can no more be disputed, than the *propriety* of *universal holiness* and *reconciliation to God.* Perhaps the reader will say, he has read a number of authors on the doctrine of universalism, and finds considerable difference in their systems. That I acknowledge is true; but all agree in the main point, viz. that *universal holiness* and *happiness* is the *great object* of the *gospel plan.* And as for the different ways in which individuals may believe this work will be done, it proves nothing against the main point; but proves, what I wish could be proved concerning all other *Christian denominations,* that they have set up no standard of their own, to cause all to bow to, or be rejected as heretics. We feel our own imperfections; we wish for every one to seek with all his might after wisdom; and let it be found where it may, or by whom it may, we humbly wish to have it brought to light, that all may enjoy it; but do not feel authorized to condemn an honest enquirer after truth, for what he believes different from a majority of us.

A few sentences, which the reader will find towards the close of this work, which have reference to a punishment after death, may cause him to desire more of my ideas on the subject.

The doctrine of punishment after death, has, by many able writers, been contended for; some of whom have argued such punishment to be endless, and others limited. But it appears to me that they have taken wrong ground who have endeavored to support the latter, as well as those who have labored to prove the former. They have both put great dependence on certain figurative and parabolical expressions, or passages of scripture, which they *explain,* so as to cause them to allude to such an event. It appears to me, that they have not sufficiently attended to the nature of sin, so as

to learn its punishment to be produced from a law of *necessity*, and not a law of *penalty*. Had they seen this, they would have seen, that a perpetuity of punishment must be connected with an equal continuance of sin, on the same principle that an effect is dependant on its cause. Who in the world would contend, that a man, who had sinned one year, could expiate his guilt, by sinning five more, with greater turpitude of heart? State the punishment, say a thousand years, for a sinner who dies in unbelief. What is it for? Say for his incorrigibleness in this world. Well, does he commit sin during these thousand years? Surely, or he could not be miserable. Then, I ask, if it takes a thousand years punishment in another world, to reward a sinner for, say fifty years sin in this, how long must he be punished, afterwards, for the sin he commits during the thousand years? The punishment, or sufferings, which we endure, in consequence of sin, is not a dispensation of any *penal law*, but of the *law* of *necessity*, in which law, as long as cause continues, it produces its effects. Therefore, to prove a man will suffer condemnation for sin, at thirty, forty, or fifty years of age, it would be necessary to prove that he would be a sinner at that time, or those times. So, in order to prove that a man will be miserable, after this mortal life is ended, it must first be proved that he will sin in the next state of existence.

It has been argued, by many, that the doctrine of future punishment, or misery, is a necessary doctrine to dissuade men from committing sin, which surely surprises me. To tell a person who is in *love* of *sin*, that if he does not immediately refrain, he will have to *continue* in *sin* for a long time, would be *true*, *besure*; but would be void of force to dissuade him from what he is in *love* with. I believe, that as long as men sin, they will be miserable, be that time longer or shorter; and that as soon as they cease from sin, they begin to experience divine enjoyment.

The scripture speaks of the *times* of the *restitution*, of *all things*, but does not inform us their number, or their

duration. It also speaks of the *fullness* of *times*, but gives no date, or duration of them.

I have not stated so many objections against the doctrine which I have labored to prove, as many of my readers may wish I had, nor so many as I should have been glad to, was it not for swelling the work to more of an expensive size. But I have stated, and endeavored to answer the most frequent objections, and those on which my opposers put the most dependance; and I should have taken great satisfaction in communicating many more arguments, both from reason & scripture, in favor of universal holiness and happiness, than I have, was it not for the reason assigned in the other case. However, if those objections which I have taken notice of, are answered to the reader's satisfaction, other scriptures, generally used as arguments against the salvation of all men, will not be hard to be understood, as not unfavorable to the doctrine. And as for the proofs which I have deduced from scripture and reason, I believe them entirely conclusive; but if not, more of the same kind would not be.

The reason I have not particularly explained those parables of the New-Testament which I have had occasion to notice, in this work, is, my Notes, of which, mention is made on the title page of this book, are before the public, and contain my ideas on most of the parables spoken by Christ.

A question may be asked by many, which has labored much in my mind, respecting the propriety of publishing books on divinity, when we profess to believe in the book called the *Bible*, that it contains all which we mean to communicate as truth, in matters of religion; on which question, I am determined for myself, that the gospel of Jesus Christ would have been better understood, had the Bible been the only book ever read on the subject. And though I doubt not but many authors have done great justice to those subjects on which they have written, and the light of the scriptures have, by such means, been caused to shine; yet, by others, it has been greatly obscured. And had one half the at-

tention been paid to the *Bible*, which has been paid to those authors who have written upon it, it would, in my opinion, have been incomparably better for Christendom. But, on account of errors imbibed, in consequence of erroneous annotations, it may be argued, that it is now necessary to write and publish correct sentiments, by the same parity of reasoning as we argue the necessity of those means to restore health, which are not necessary to continue it.

To the short exhortation, with which the believer in universalism will meet with, in this work, he is humbly invited to pay strict attention ; as no faith, however true it may be, can be of any real service to the believer, unless it is accompanied with the spirit and life of that truth in which it is grounded. The greater the beauty of a person, the more lamentable his death. The more divinity there is in any faith, the greater is the pity it sould not be alive. " As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also "

My brethren in the ministry will not think it assuming, that I have spoken of the necessity of our paying strict attention to the stewardship into which God by his grace hath put us ; as it was not written so much to instruct, as to show the brethren my faith ; that they may see the ground on which I stand ; know the manner in which I contend for the faith once delivered to the saints ; and feel for me the same fellowship which I feel for them. You may regret that my ideas were not more correct, in many instances, and think the great subject on which I have written, might have obtained better justice from some more experienced writer, in which you have the same ideas with myself. But in this you may be satisfied, that I have written as I now think and believe, without leaning to the right, or to the left, to please, or displease. I have been often solicited to write and publish my general ideas on the gospel, but have commonly observed to my friends, that it might be attended with disagreeable consequences, as it is impossible to determine whether the ideas which we entertain at the present time are agreeable to

those which we shall be under the necessity of adopting after we have had more experience; and knowing, to my satisfaction, that authors are very liable to feel such an attachment to sentiments which they have openly avowed to the world, that their prejudice frequently obstructs their further acquisitions in the knowledge of the truth; and even in cases of conviction, their own self-importance will keep them from acknowledging their mistakes: And having some knowledge of my own infirmities, I felt the necessity of precaution, which, I have no reason to believe, is, or has been injurious.

I have had, for some time, an intention to write a treatise on this subject, but thought of deferring it until more experience might enable me to perform it better, and leisure give me opportunity to be more particular. But the consideration of the uncertainty of life was one great stimulus to my undertaking it at this time, added to a possibility of living to be informed with what success it meets in the world, and of having an opportunity to correct whatever I might, in my future studies, find incorrect, were not the smallest causes of my undertaking it.

It has often been said, by the enemies of the doctrine for which I have contended, that it would do to live by, but not to die by; meaning that it would not give the mind satisfaction, when sensible it was about to leave a mortal, for an immortal state. As to the truth of the assertion, I cannot positively say, that moment has not yet been experienced by me; and, as those who make the remark have never believed the doctrine, I cannot see how they should know any better than I do. Thus much I can say, I believe I have seen, and often heard of persons rejoicing in the doctrine, in the last hours of their lives; but I do not build my faith on such grounds. The sorrows or the joys of persons, in their last moments, prove nothing to me of the truth of their general belief. A Jew, who despises the name of Christ, from the force of his education, may be filled with comfortable hopes, in his last moments, from the

force of the same education. I have no doubt but a person may believe, or pretend to believe, in the doctrine of universal salvation, when he knows of no solid reason for his belief, but has rather rested the matter on the judgment of those in whom he has placed more confidence, than he has, in reality, on the Saviour of the world; and I think it very possible that such universalists may have strange and unexpected fears, when the near approach of death, or any other circumstance, should cause them to think more seriously, on so weighty a subject.

There must be a time, with all men, whose faith and confidence are placed in any thing short of divine mercy, that will be extremely trying; and all the education in the world cannot prevent it.

What my feelings might be, concerning the doctrine which I believe, was I called to contemplate it on a *death bed*, I am unable to say, as I am what I may think of it a year hence, should I *live*, and be in *health*. But I am satisfied, beyond a doubt, that if I live a year longer, and then find cause to give up my present belief, that I shall not feel a consciousness of having professed what I did not *sincerely believe*; and was I called to leave the *world*, and my *writings* in it, and at the *last hour* of my *life* should find I had *erred*, yet I am *satisfied* that I should *possess* the *approbation* of a *good conscience* in *all* I have *written*.

Therefore, though sensible of my imperfections, yet enjoying great consolation in believing the doctrine for which I have argued, in the following work, and in the enjoyment of a good conscience, I submit the following pages to a generous and candid public, praying for the *blessing* of the GOD whom I *serve*, on the *feeble endeavors* of the *most unworthy whom* he hath *called* as a *servant* of *all men*.

THE AUTHOR.

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT.

IN this Treatiſe on Atonement, I ſhall confine myſelf to three general inquiries. 1ſt. Of *Sin.* 2d. Of *Atonement* for *Sin.* 3d. Of the *Conſequences* of *Atonement* to *Mankind.* Theſe particulars may be repreſented by a *diſorder;* the *remedy* for the *diſorder*, and the *health* enjoyed in conſequence of a *cure.*

And 1ſt. Of ſin, which, for the ſake of the caſe, I ſubdivide as follows. 1. Its *nature.* 2. Its *cauſe.* And 3. Its *effects.*

And firſt, of the *nature* of ſin. Sin is the violation of a law which exiſts in the mind, which law is the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good. This law is tranſgreſſed, whenever, by the influence of temptation, a good underſtanding yields to a contrary choice. Where a law exiſts, it preſuppoſes a legiſlature, whoſe intention, in legiſlation, muſt be *thwarted*, in order for the law to take cognition of

ſin. The legiſlature, in all moral accountable beings, is a capacity to underſtand, connected with the cauſes and means of knowledge, which, ſtanding or exiſting on finite and limited principles, will juſtify my ſuppoſition, that ſin, in its nature, ought to be conſidered finite and limited, rather than infinite and unlimited, as has, by many, been ſuppoſed.

By offering my reaſons againſt the infinity of ſin, I ſhall open to an eaſy method of ſhowing it to be finite. The ſuppoſition that ſin is infinite, is ſupported, or rather pretended to be ſupported, on the conſideration of its being committed againſt an *infinite law*, which is produced by an *infinite legislature*, who is *God himſelf*. I have before obſerved, and I think juſtly, that the intention of a legiſlature, in legiſlation, muſt be *thwarted*, in order for the law to take *cognition* of *ſin*. Now if God, in a direct ſenſe of ſpeaking, is the legiſlator of the law which is *thwarted* by *transgression*, in the ſame direct ſenſe of ſpeaking, his *intentions* in *legiſlation* are *thwarted*. With eyes open, the reader cannot but ſee, that if ſin is infinite becauſe it is committed againſt an infinite law, whoſe author is God, the deſign of Deity muſt be *abortive*; to ſuppoſe which, brings a cloud of darkneſs over the mind, as *intenſe* as the ſuppoſition

is *erroneous*. It cannot with any propriety be supposed, that any rational being can have an intention contrary to the knowledge which he possesses. Was a resolve brought into the State Legislature to be passed into an act, it would be very unlikely to succeed, providing the legislature knew that the intention of the act would utterly fail. It is possible, and very frequently the case, that *imperfect* beings *desire* contrary to their knowledge; but this, in every instance, is *proof* and often the *cause* of their *misery*. In such cases, misery rises to an exact proportion to the strength of desire. Now to reason justly, we must conclude, that if God possesses infinite wisdom, he could never intend any thing to take place, or to be, that will not take place, or be; nor that which is or will be, not to be, at the time when it is. And it must be considered erroneous to suppose that the *All wise* ever *desired* any thing to take place, which by his wisdom, he knew would not; as such a supposition must, in effect, suppose a degree of *misery* in the *eternal mind*, *equal* to the *strength* of his *fruitless desire!* Were this the case, all the misery to which mortals are subject, bears not the thousandth part of the proportion to the miseries of the Divine Being, as the smallest imaginable atom does to the weight of the ponderous

globe; providing, at the same time, the idea of infinity is attached to Deity! Again, if we admit of a disappointment to the Supreme Being, even in the smallest matter of consideration, it follows, that we have no satisfactory evidence whereby to prove that any thing, at present, in the whole universe, is as the supreme intended. All the harmonies of nature, which, to the eye of wondering man, are so convincing of the existence of that power, wisdom and goodness which he adores, may have continued their laws in active force much longer than God intended; brought into existence millions of beings more than were contemplated in creation; and by this time become a perfect nuisance to the general plan of the Almighty. The admission of the error refuted, would sink the mind to the nether parts of moral depravity, where darkness reigns in all its horrors.

The above arguments are introduced, to show the absurdity of admitting a violation of the intention of the Supreme Legislator.

I now turn on the other side, & admit, as a fact, what I have sufficiently refuted, viz. that the *intentions* of *God* as a *Supreme Legislator* are *violated* by the *sin* of *finite beings;* but must beg leave to inform the reader that the proposition will by no means afford the intended consequen-

ces ; but yields me an argument in favor of the *finite* nature of *sin*, which I do not want, and of which I shall make no other use than to *explode* the *proposition itself*. If any intention of deity was ever thwarted, it proves, without evasion, that he is not *infinite ;* if so, his *will* or *intention, cannot* be *infinite ;* and, therefore, the consequences intended by the proposition are forever lost, as they exist only upon the supposition of his being *infinite*. If it be argued, that the intentions of Deity, as a legislator, are violated, not *strictly* in an *infinite sense*, but in some subordinate degree, it is giving up the ground contended for, to all intents ; for, if the *intention violated*, is not *infinite*, the *sin* of *violating* it, cannot be *infinite*.

Again, if sin is *infinite* and *unlimited*, it cannot be superseded by any *principle* or *being* in the *universe ;* for *goodness* cannot be *more* than *infinite*, neither is there a *degree* for *Deity* to *occupy above it*. And it may be further argued, that the admission of the error refuted, would be a denial of any *Supreme Being* in the universe ; for as Deity does not supersede *sin*, he cannot be *superior* to that which is *equal* to *himself!*

Again, I further enquire, can that be considered as an *infinite evil*, which is

limited in its *consequences?* The anſwer muſt be in the negative. If ſin is an *infinite evil*, and *infinite* in its *consequences*, as an *evil* not only *all created* beings muſt ſuffer endleſſly by it, but God *himſelf* can never ceaſe to experience the torment-giving power of that which he is *unable* to *avoid!* I ſay more, if ſin is *infinite* and *unlimited*, for it muſt be unlimited, if it is infinite, it follows that there is no ſuch principle in the univerſe, as any one property which we are wont to attribute to the *Almighty;* for, if once we admit a principle of *divine juſtice* to have an exiſtence, it is granted that *ſin* is *bounded* by it, and therefore, cannot be *infinite;* and it is a fact that ſin can no where exiſt, only where it can be compared with juſtice. Again, it ought not to be ſuppoſed, that the intentions of Deity were ever violated, if we admit, at the ſame time, that he had power to avoid ſuch violation. And who, in their ſenſes, will ſay, that, that which is unavoidable by God, is avoidable by man?

Enough, undoubtedly, is ſaid, to ſhow the egregious miſtake of ſuppoſing ſin to be infinite; and more need not be written on the ſubject, were it not by ſome contended, that Job xxii. 5, is in full proof of the infinity of ſin. "Is not thy wickedneſs great? and thine iniquities infinite?"

In anſwer to this paſſage, I need only turn the reader to chap. xlii. 7, "And it was ſo, that after the Lord had ſpoken theſe words unto Job, the Lord ſaid unto Eliphaz the Timnite, my wrath is kindled againſt thee, and againſt thy two friends, for ye have not ſpoken of me the thing that is right as my ſervant Job hath." Obſerve, kind reader, the words which are brought to prove the infinity of ſin, are neither the words of God, nor of one whom he approved, but they are the words of that Timnite, againſt whom God's anger was kindled, for not ſpeaking the thing that was right.

Once more, and I cloſe this part of my query. If ſin is *infinite* in its *nature*, there can be no one ſin greater than another. The ſmalleſt offence againſt the good of ſociety, is equal to *blaſphemy* againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*. If what we call a ſmall crime, is not infinite, the greateſt cannot be, providing there is any proportion between the great and the ſmall. Are not the words of Chriſt, Matt. xii. 31, where he ſpeaks of ſins and blaſphemies that ſhould be forgiven unto men, and of blaſphemies that ſhould not be forgiven men, a ſufficient evidence that ſome ſins are more heinous than others? Again, 1 Epiſtle of John v. 16, where ſome ſins are ſaid to be not unto death, & ſome unto death, &c

Now, admitting the matter proved, that sin is not infinite, it follows, of course, that it is proved to be finite. However, we will now attend to the direct evidences of the finite nature of sin.

The law which takes cognition of sin is not infinite. it being produced by the legislature which I have before noticed, viz. a capacity to understand, connected with the causes and means of knowledge. In order for a law to be infinite, the legislature must be so ; but man's ability to understand is finite, and all the means which are in his power for the acquisition of knowledge are finite; all his knowledge is circumscribed, and the law produced by such causes must be like them, not *infinite* but *finite*. An infinite law would be far above the capacity of a finite being and it would be unreasonable to suppose man amenable to a law above his capacity. All our knowledge of good and evil is obtained by comparison. We call an action evil by comparing it with one which we call good. Were it in our power to embrace all the consequences that are connected with our actions in our intentions, our meanings would seldom be what they now are. Had it been so with the brethren of Joseph, when they sold him to the Ishmaelites, that they then knew all the consequences which would

attend the event, they would not have meant it, as they did, for evil, but seeing with perfectly unbeclouded eyes their own salvation, and that of the whole family of promise, they would have meant it for good, as did the Almighty who superintended the affair. Now the act of selling Joseph was sin, in the meaning of those who sold him; but it was finite, considered as sin, for it was bounded by the narrowness of their understandings, limited by their ignorance, and circumscribed by the wisdom and goodness of him who meant it for good. If this sin had been infinite, nothing that we can justly call good, could have been the consequence; but whoever read the event, without seeing that the best of consequences were connected with it?

The promised seed, in whom *all* the *families* of the *earth* are to be *blessed*, according to the word of *promise* to Abraham, was to descend from that family which was preserved through seven years of famine, as a consequence of the good intended in that event. And who but God can comprehend the infinite good contained in the all glorious plan of mediatorial grace? We then see, that what, in a *limited sense*, we may justly call *sin*, or *evil*, in an *unlimited sense* is justly called *good*. We say, of the top of yonder moun-

tain, it is exceedingly high ; and of yonder valley, it is low ; and this we juſtly ſay, by comparing one with the other, in reſpect to the centre of the earth. But the moment we extend our thoughts to contemplate the millions of worlds in unbounded ſpace, and take the whole in one grand ſyſtem, the idea of high and low is loſt. So is ſin finiſhed, when, by divine grace, our underſtandings are enlightened, and we hear our ſpiritual Joſeph ſay, "Grieve not yourſelves, ye *meant* it unto *evil*, but *God meant* it unto *good*." It will be granted, on all ſides, that no action unconnected with deſign ought to be conſidered ſin ; it is then an evil intention that conſtitutes an evil action. For inſtance, a man exerting himſelf to the utmoſt of his abilities to ſave the life of his neighbor, accidentally takes his life, the conſequence is not the guilt of murder, but heart-aching grief for the loſs of his friend. Again, a man exerting himſelf with all his ingenuity and ſtrength to take the life of his neighbor, miſſes his intention and ſaves his life from immediate danger ; the conſequence is not the approbation of a good conſcience for having ſaved the life of his neighbor, but condemnation for having deſigned his death, and perhaps mortification in his diſappointment. By theſe inſtances, the reader may ſee, that no act

can be determined to be morally good, or evil, by the consequences which follow, but only by the disposition, or intention, which the actor possesses when the act is done. Then in order for the sin to be *infinite*, the *intention* of the *transgressor* must be *infinite*, embracing all the consequences that can ever arise from what he does; but this is never the case with finite beings. We never know all the effects, or consequences, that will be produced from the smallest of those acts which we do in time. It is the immediate consequences which we have in our power to calculate upon, and in them we are often deceived. Our acts as moral accountables, are all limited to the narrow circle of our understanding; therefore. our goodness is limited, being of the finite nature of our knowledge, and our sin is in the same finite and limited circle. It may be argued very justly, that as no finite cause can produce an infinite effect, no finite creature can commit infinite sin; and as every effect must stand in relation to its cause, so man being finite, cannot be the cause of any evil which does not stand in relation to man the finite cause. Should the reader suppose, that my admitting the act of selling Joseph was attended with unlimited consequences, in opposition to my sentiment, wherein I limit all actions

which originate in finite cauſes, I reply, as the act of ſelling Joſeph reſpected the purpoſe of Deity, and the plan of grace, thoſe who ſold him do not ſtand as *even* the *ſhadow* of a *cauſe*, but only as inſtruments, by which God effected his own divine and gracious purpoſe. Perhaps the reader by this time, is ready to ſay, according to this reaſoning, there can be no ſuch thing as real evil in the univerſe. If, by real evil, is meant, ſomething that ought not to be, in reſpect to all the conſequences which attend it, I cannot admit of its exiſtence; for I cannot conceive of any productive cauſe whatever, that can be, ſtrictly ſpeaking, limited in its conſequences. For inſtance, the firſt tranſgreſſion of man, no one can ſuppoſe, has ceaſed in its conſequences; for from that cauſe, the knowledge of good and evil exiſts in moral beings, and when the effects of that knowledge will ceaſe, I cannot imagine. If it is objected, that, to call that a ſin which produces an infinite continuance of good effects, it muſt be abſurd; I ſay, in reply, the objection comes too late; for it is already proved, that the conſequences of an act do not determine whether the act is good, or evil.

I have, in the foregoing queries, ſpoken of that kind of ſin which is productive of remorſe; however, we read, beſure, of the

ſin of *ignorance*, ſee Num. xv. 27, &c.; but this I conceive to be more of a legal than a moral nature, and it is ſometimes called error; it is in a thouſand inſtances productive of ſorrow and diſappointment, but never of guilt. If we conſider the Jews under their law, or the Gentiles, who, the apoſtle ſays, were a law unto themſelves, we ſhall find them expoſed to guilt, on the ſame principles. Therefore, moral tranſgreſſion muſt vary, as the knowledge and underſtanding of men vary in various circumſtances.

If it is thought by the reader, that I have paſſed over the ſpirit of the law, which is *love* to God in a ſuperlative degree, and an eſteem for our neighbors equal to that which we have for ourſelves, I anſwer, I have not altogether paſſed by it. This law of divine love is that infinite law of perfection, which is higher than our capacities extend, in a finite ſtate. The law given to Iſrael literally ſpeaking, was only a ſhadow of the ſpirit of love; and all our knowledge of moral holineſs is but a faint reſemblance of that ſublime rectitude from which the moſt upright of the ſons of men are at a great diſtance.

Having hinted ſo much on the nature of ſin as to make the ſubject plain to the reader's underſtanding I will now paſs to an inquiry into its cauſe, or origin.

The origin of sin has, among christians in general, been very easily accounted for; but in a way, I must confess, that never gave me any satisfaction, since I came to think for myself on subjects of this nature. A short chimerical story from the bard, Milton, has given perfect satisfaction to millions, respecting the introduction of moral evil into the moral system which we occupy. The substance of the account is, Sometime before the creation of man, the Almighty created multitudes of spiritual beings, called angels: Some of these creatures of God were much higher in dignity and authority than others, but all perfectly destitute of sin, or moral turpitude. One dignified above all the rest, stood Prime Minister of the Almighty, clothed with the highest missive power, and clad with garments of primeval light; obsequious to nothing but the high behest of his Creator, he discharged the functions of his office with a promptitude and dignity, suited to the eminency of his station, and to the admiration of celestial millions. But when it pleased Jehovah to reveal the brightness of his glory and the image of the Godhead in humanity, he gave forth the command, see Psalm xcvii. 7. "Worship him, all ye gods." And Heb. i. 6. "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into

the world, he faith, and let all the angels of God worſhip him." Lucifer, Son of the Morning, (as Chriſtians have called him) furpriſed at the idea of worſhiping any being but God himſelf, looked on the Son with ineffable diſdain, and in a moment grew indignant, bruſhed his ſtrongeſt pinions, and waved his wings for the throne of God, challenged ſupremacy with the Almighty, and caſt his eye to the ſides of the north as a ſuitable place to eſtabliſh his empire. Legions of ſpirits followed this chief in rebellion, and formed a dangerous party, in the kingdom of the Almighty. The Son of God was inveſted with full power as Generaliſſimo of heaven, to command the remaining forces, againſt the common enemy. And in ſhort, after many grievous battles between armies of contending ſpirits, where life could not, in the leaſt, be expoſed, Lucifer and his party were driven out of heaven, leaving it in peace, though, in a great meaſure, depopulated!

God having created the earth, and placed the firſt man and woman in a moſt happy ſituation of innocence and moral purity, without the ſmalleſt appetite for ſin, or propenſity to evil, the arch Apoſtate enviouſly looked from his fiery priſon, to which he was conſigned by the command of the Almighty, and beholding men plac-

ed in so happy a situation, and in a capacity to increase to infinite multitudes, by which the kingdom of heaven would be enlarged, was determined to crop this tree in the bud. He, therefore, turns into a serpent, goes to the woman and beguiles her, gets her to eat of a fruit which *God* had forbidden, by which mean he introduced sin into our system.

I have not been particular in this sketch, but it contains the essence of the common idea. I shall now put it under examination, looking diligently for the propriety of accounting for the origin of moral evil in this way.

And first, of this memorable rebellion in heaven! It seems, that this rebel angel was always obedient to the commands of his Maker, until the hour of his fall; that there was not the least spot of pollution in him, until he felt the emotions of pride, which lifted him above submission to the Son of God. This being the case, I ask, was this angel ignorant of the real character of the Son, whom he was commanded to worship? If he was not, but knew it to be no other than the true Eternal, his Creator, manifested in a nature which Jehovah created; if he loved his Maker as he ought to do, which none pretend to dispute; he would have worshiped him with due reverence, the moment he made the

diſcovery and heard the command: This no perſon in his ſenſes will diſpute. If he did not know the real character whom he was commanded to worſhip, had he complied, he would have worſhipped, he knew not what. And nothing can be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe that infinite wiſdom would command his creatures to worſhip ignorantly. I aſk, further, could purity produce impurity; or moral holineſs, unholineſs? All anſwer, no. Was not the angel holy in every faculty? Was not the command, for him to worſhip the Son, holy and juſt? All anſwer, yes. Then from ſuch cauſes, how was ſin produced? The reader will eaſily ſee, the queſtion cannot be anſwered. Now, reader, be ſo kind as to turn to the ſcripture, to which I have referred you on this ſubject, and ſee if we have any authority for ſaying, that either gods or angels refuſed to worſhip, when commanded. "Again, when he bringeth in the firſt begotten into the world, he ſaith, and let all the angels of God worſhip him." That this firſt begotten is Chriſt, no doubt will be entertained. But when was he brought into the world? before, or ſince the firſt tranſgreſſion of man? Since, moſt certainly. Then, ſuppoſing millions of angels had ſinned at that time, it could have had no conſequence

productive of man's tranſgreſſion, as a cauſe cannot be poſterior to its effects. Therefore, to ſuppoſe, that thoſe angels who never ſinned until long after man became a tranſgreſſor, were the inſtigators of what is called the fall, diſcovers a want of calculation. And further, what authority have we for believing that the command was diſobeyed? We find nothing connected with either paſſage, viz. that in Pſalms, or that in Hebrews, which intimates a refuſal among the gods, or angels. And I ſee no need of ſuppoſing, that by gods, in one text, or by angels, in the other, any other beings are intended than men. In reſpect to the command for all the gods to worſhip him, I obſerve, "they were called gods to whom the word of God came, and the ſcriptures cannot be broken." And the command, for all the angels of God to worſhip, ſtands on this proper ground; by angels, are meant meſſengers, who are employed by God, for the information of his fellow men; but as all theſe meſſengers, or miniſters, were inferior to the "Meſſenger of the covenant," whom the Lord promiſed to ſend unto Jeruſalem, it was ſuitable to ſhow his ſuperiority, by giving ſuch a token, in the ſcriptures, as commanding all the angels to worſhip him. There is another paſſage in the xivth of Iſaiah 12, &c.

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didſt weaken the nations! for thou haſt ſaid in thine heart, I will aſcend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the ſtars of God; I will ſet alſo upon the mount of the congregation in the *sides* of the *north*, &c.

"Here," I have been told' "we have a particular account of the ſin which Satan committed in heaven." But as there is nothing in this paſſage, or its connexions, that has reference to any other creature or being, as Lucifer, Son of the Morning, than the King of Babylon, I ſhall ſay but little upon it. Obſerve, the queſtion is aſked. How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, who *didst* weaken the nations? This Lucifer weakened the nations before he fell, but was unable to weaken them afterwards. He ſaid in his heart he would aſcend into heaven. Was this the ſin of Satan, as is generally ſuppoſed? Was he not already in heaven? How then ſhould he ſay in his heart, I will aſcend into heaven? I will not trouble the reader with any thing ſo vague as the vulgar application of this ſcripture, only enough to ſhow that it had no ſuch meaning. The King of Babylon is pointed out, in this prophecy, as exalt-

ing his throne above the *stars* of God, which, in a figurative ſenſe, undoubtedly meant his exalting himſelf by the reduction of the Jews, who are figuratively called the *stars* of God.

Again, this angel of light muſt have been very ignorant of the power and goodneſs of the Almighty, in order to have poſſeſſed a thought, that to rebel againſt him could be of any poſſible advantage, or that he could have carried and maintained a conteſt with him. If he was as ignorant as all this, the inhabitants of *heaven* muſt have been extremely uncultivated, in that age of eternity, and no great ornament to a place ſo much famed for glory and grandeur. If heaven, which is ſaid to be God's throne, is, or ever was, inhabited by defectable beings, the place itſelf muſt be a defectable place; and why the Almighty ſhould take up his ſpecial abode in a defectable place, ſurrounded by defectable beings, I cannot imagine. But I paſs on—

After Satan was turned out of heaven, he ſaw no poſſible way to injure his adverſary, only by contaminating his creatures, which he had juſt made, and placed in the happy ſituation before deſcribed. Here obſerve, the matter appears ſtrange. Did God not know the evil diſpoſition of Satan? Had he forgotten the awful difficulty but juſt ſettled? Or would he leave an innocent

Lamb to the ferocity of a bear robbed of her whelps ? God had driven Satan from heaven, from his own preſence, but left him at looſe ends to prey on his tender offspring, whom he had juſt left in a defenceleſs ſituation, on this ball of earth! What would appear more unnatural and ſhocking, than for a father to chaſe his enemy out at his door, but leave him to ſlay his defenceleſs children in the ſtreet ? I ſhall, after what I have obſerved, beg liberty to ſay, I am ſo far from believing any ſuch ſtory reſpecting the cauſe of ſin, that I have not even the ſhadow of evidence, from ſcripture or reaſon, to ſupport the ſentiment. But I have been told, that man, ſtanding in a ſtate of ſinleſs purity, could not have fallen from that rectitude, unleſs there had been ſome ſinful being to have tempted him. Admitting there is any force in this obſervation, it ſtands as directly againſt the fall of Satan, without a ſinful temptation, as it does againſt man's tranſgreſſion without a tempter. Was man more pure, before he ſinned, than that holy angel in heaven ? If not, how could that angel ſin, without a temptation, eaſier than man, who was made in a lower grade ? But ſuppoſing we ſhould admit that God commanded an angel to worſhip his Son Jeſus, and the angel refuſed, and call that the firſt ſin ever commit-

ted, it would not determine its origin or cauſe. A cauſe, or origin, muſt exiſt, before an effect, or production. So, after all our journeying to heaven after a ſinning angel, and after purſuing him to hell, and from hell to the earth, we have not yet anſwered the queſtion, viz. What is the origin of ſin? We have only ſhewn, that the way in which this queſtion has been generally ſolved, is without foundation.

Having ſtated what I have been told was the origin of ſin, and given my reaſons why I do not believe it, I now come to give my own ideas of the matter.

Scripture, with the aſſiſtance of that reaſon, without which, the ſcriptures would be of no more ſervice to us than they are to the brute creation, I ſhall take for my guide, on the queſtion before me. Almighty God is a being of infinite perfections; this the ſcripture will ſupport, and reaſon declares: He was the author of our exiſtence, being the creator of the firſt man and woman, the occaſion of their being formed of the duſt of the ground, and the director of that providence by which we are all introduced by ordinary generation. Our Maker muſt have had a deſign in the works of his hands; this the ſcriptures argue, and reaſon ſays. The whole of God's deſign muſt be carried into

effect, and nothing more, admitting him to be an infinite being. We are informed, that God created man in his own image; that he bleſſed him, and ſet him over the works of his hands; and reaſon cannot deny the truth of it. But what was this image of God, in which man was created? Anſwer, it was Chriſt, who, in ſcripture, is called "the beginning of the creation of God;" who, St. Paul ſays, is the brightneſs of the Father's glory, and expreſs image of his perſon. Now there is no need of ſaying much, where the truth is eaſy to come at. If Chriſt is the image of God, and man was created in God's image, it is plain, that man was created in Chriſt, was bleſſed in Chriſt, and in Chriſt ſet over the works of God's hands. After God had finiſhed his work of creation, conſecrated the ſeventh day, and reſted from his labor, we are informed that there was not a man to till the ground. This information is reaſonable, and authoriſes me to ſay, that as man ſtood in his *created* character, which is Chriſt, the heavenly man, he was not, at that time, formed of the duſt of the ground, was not of the earth earthly, and therefore was not a tiller of the ground. We are then informed, by the ſacred text, that God *formed* (not created) man of the duſt of the ground, breathed into his noſtrils the

breath of life, whereby man became a living ſoul, or creature. Man is now a partaker of fleſh and blood; is, as the apoſtle ſays, "*made subject* to *vanity*, not willingly, but by reaſon of him who ſubjected the ſame in hope." He has now, not an immortal, but a mortal conſtitution; is poſſeſſed of natural appetites and paſſions; and being unacquainted with the ways of his own imperfect ſelf, knew neither the good or evil of a mortal ſtate. If it be ſaid, that man was not mortal, before he ſinned, and that he became mortal by ſin, it is a ſaying as diſtant from good reaſon as imagination can go. For if man was not *mortal* before tranſgreſſion, he muſt have been *immortal;* if he was *immortal* he was not ſubject to change, but remains in the ſame *immortal* ſtate; and all our notions about the mortality of man is nothing but a groundleſs chimera. But every day's experience contradicts ſuch abſurdities.

Man, according to theſe ſtatements, is of heavenly extraction; is, in his nature, allied to the heavenly ſtate, in which he was created, before he was formed of the duſt of the ground. And I call on the reaſon of my reader to teſtify to the rationality of the idea. If the mind, ſpirit, ſoul, or whatever the reader pleaſes to call the immortal part of man, originated from

the earthly nature of the formed creature, what is the reaſon that the good, which ſupports the formed nature, does not ſatiſfy the ſoul? Our natural appetites originate in the elements of which our bodies are compoſed, and aliment produced from them is ſufficient to ſatisfy any natural appetite of the body; but can it give a cup of conſolation to the heavenly ſtranger within? No; her food is of a different kind. Was the earth, with all her mines and fruits, my own, this moment, on condition that I ſhould give up the riches which I ſee in this heavenly relation, my bargain would make me poor.

As man ſtood in his former ſtate, cloathed with mortal fleſh and blood, before his mind became obſequious to elementary paſſions, a law was ſhadowed to his mind from the heavenly and ſpiritual man. The full ſpirit, power and beauty of the law, were not perfectly underſtood, only a ſhadow of the heavenly nature paſſed on his mind, and the nature of that ſpirit being eternal, and immortally pure, was oppoſed to the paſſions which would immediately ariſe from the fleſhly nature, and laid in the underſtanding of the creature already made ſubject to vanity. *yield not to the paſſions and powers of the fleſh, for they are death.* But immediately the

powerful vibrations of the fleſhly nature abſorbed his mind, he ſought to the carnal man for food, ate, and died. Theſe things are figuratively repreſented, in the ſcriptures. There man is repreſented as being placed in a garden of delights, to keep it and dreſs it. The tree of life was in it, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil; he was bid welcome to the tree of life, but was forbidden the other. A ſubtle ſerpent comes to the woman, and tempts her with the forbidden fruit; ſhe eats, and gives it to her huſband, and he alſo partakes: Their eyes are opened to the knowledge of good and evil; they ſee that they are naked, and hide themſelves from God; ſew fig leaves together for garments to hide their nakedneſs. God comes into the garden, in the cool of the day, calls for the man, and aſks him if he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. He anſwers, that the woman whom God gave him, gave unto him and he ate. The woman is next interrogated, and ſhe lays it to the ſerpent's guile. The ground is curſed, for Adam's ſake; when he tills it, it is to produce briars and thorns; he is to eat his bread by the ſweat of his face, and at last return to the duſt. The woman's conception was to be multiplied in ſorrow, and her deſire was to be to her huſband, and he was to rule over her. The

ſerpent was curſed above all cattle, was to go on his belly, and to eat duſt as long as he lived. This is, in ſhort, the ſcripture repreſentation of the firſt ſin; and I conſider it to be figurative.

That the Almighty ever planted a literal garden on earth, without uſing man as an inſtrument by which he did it, I have not evidence enough to believe. The garden, undoubtedly meant the moral ſtate in which man was placed, which, like a garden, would become foul, if it was not dreſſed and kept. The tree of life, was then, what it is now, the law of the ſpirit of *life* in Chriſt Jeſus; and the *little* of that ſpirit which was then manifeſted, was all the *moral* life which man poſſeſſed at that time; and, therefore, all which he was able to ſin againſt. The tree of the knowledge of good & evil, was what it is now, the fleſhly nature, which I have before deſcribed. The oppoſition of the law of the heavenly man, to that of the fleſhly, is meant by the prohibition. The ſerpent, ſignifies the carnal mind, which is enmity againſt God, is not ſubject to the law of the heavenly man, neither indeed can be. The carnal mind getting the victory over the *law* of *life*, in the underſtanding of the creature, is meant by the woman's being deceived. Adam is here the figure of him who was to come; and his partaking

with the woman, ſhows that Chriſt would bear the infirmities of human nature, his bride, who, in reſpect to individuality, ſhould be multiplied in ſorrow, but ſhould finally turn her deſire towards her Redeemer, and he ſhould protect her. The ſerpent, the curſed, is the carnal mind. His going on his belly, ſignifies his always being moved by fleſhly luſts; and his feeding on duſt, teaches that carnal mindedneſs never feeds on heavenly things, but on things of an earthly nature. And we may juſtly obſerve, that after all the cultivation which is beſtowed on the carnal or fleſhly nature, it produces nothing better than briars and thorns.

Should it be ſaid, that this garden was a literal garden, that the tree of life was a literal tree, and that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was alſo literal; I ſhould be glad to be informed, what evidence can be educed in ſupport of ſuch an idea. Where is the garden now? Where is the tree of life now? Where is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil now? Are thoſe trees now growing on the earth as literal trees? We are not informed, in the ſcriptures, that this garden was carried off to heaven, or that either of thoſe trees was removed. It is written, that God drove the man whom he had made out of the garden, and placed cherubims

and a flaming fword at the eaft of the garden, to prevent the man from approaching the tree of life. If the garden was literal, why could not Adam have gone into it on the north, fouth, or weft fide? But the *eaft* is the *birth place* of *light*, and the cherubims and the flaming fword repreſent the law with its executive authority, which produces guilt and condemnation in the mind, and which is the death Adam died on the very day of his trangreffion.

The path-way of underſtanding is now open and clear. *God* faw fit, in his plan of divine wifdom, to make the creature ſubject to vanity; to give him a mortal conſtitution; to fix on his nature thoſe faculties which would, in their operation, oppoſe the ſpirit of the heavenly nature. It is, therefore, ſaid, that *God put enmity* between the ſeed of the woman, and that of the ſerpent. And it was by the paſſions which aroſe from the fleſhly nature, that the whole mind became carnal, and man became captivated thereby. But perhaps the objector will ſay, this denies the *liberty* of the *will*, and makes *God* the *author* of *ſin*. To which I reply, deſiring the reader to recollect what I have ſaid of ſin in ſhowing its nature; by which it is diſcovered, that God may be the innocent and holy cauſe of that, which, in a limited

ſenſe, is ſin ; but as it reſpects the meaning of God, it is intended for good. It is not caſting any diſagreeable reflections on the Almighty, to ſay he determined all things for good ; and to believe he ſuperſedes all the affairs of the univerſe, not excepting ſin, is a million times more to the honor of God, than to believe he *cannot*, or that he does not when he can. The reader will then aſk, if God muſt be conſidered as the firſt, the holy, and the innnocent cauſe of ſin, is there any unholy or impure cauſes ? I anſwer, there is, but in a limited ſenſe. There is no divine holineſs in any fleſhly or carnal exerciſe ; there is no holineſs nor purity in all the deceptions ever experienced in imperfect beings ; and theſe are the immediate cauſes of ſin ; and as ſuch, they make the beſt of men on earth groan, and cry out, " Who ſhall deliver me from the *body* of this *death !*"

If it ſhould be granted that ſin will finally terminate for good, in the moral ſyſtem, it will then be neceſſary to admit that *God* is its firſt cauſe, or we cannot ſay that God is the author of all good. If we ſay, that ſin is not for the good of God's ſyſtem, but is a damage, we muſt alſo ſay that God would have prevented its taking place, if it had been in his power ; if it was not in his power, he is not Almighty ;

neither can we say he is supreme in an unlimited sense, as he was not superior to the causes which produced sin. But, to say, that God is the author of sin, says the reader, sounds very badly, let you put what coloring you please upon it; and if I believed it, I should not dare to say it. Well, what shall I say, in order to please? Say the Devil was the author of sin. But did the Devil make himself? No; God made him an holy angel, and he made himself a devil, by transgression. Well, *God* made an angel, and that angel made a devil of himself, or any thing else, proves that God was the first cause as directly as any thing which I have argued. The objector will further say, that that angel was made a moral agent, and therefore ought to be considered the author of his own sin. But I say, in reply, that if God produced an agency, and that agency produced sin, it argues that God is the first cause, and agency the second and effective cause. If this mode of reasoning is faulted, I ask, is not God the origin and cause of all moral righteousness? None can be perverse enough to say no; then I ask, again, If moral agency, created by God, is not the *original* cause of moral *righteousness*, by what rule of reasoning, can it be made the *original* cause of *transgression?* But I have before refuted the

notion about this ſinning angel. I now call the attention of the reader to man, which is our proper ſtudy; and attend to the objection as it reſpects the liberty of the will. But, in the firſt place, for the ſake of the argument, I will conſent to any liberty of the will which is contended for; and then aſk, what was the cauſe of man's having liberty of will? My opponent muſt allow it was God. Well, if God produced a *liberty* of *will* in man, and that liberty of will produced ſin, is there any great difficulty in ſeeing, that that is making God the original cauſe of ſin, in every ſenſe in which I have argued it? What would the objector wiſh to be underſtood to mean, by will? If it is any thing more or leſs than choice, I am at a loſs about it. If it is choice, then what we have to look into, is the *liberty* of choice. In order for choice to take place, the mind muſt have perceptions of two, or more objects; and that object which has the moſt influence on the judgment and paſſions, will be the choſen object; and *choice*, in this inſtance, has not even the *ſhadow* of *liberty*. None will be vain enough to ſay, that will, or choice, has any liberty before it exiſts, and choice does not exiſt until an object is choſen; and to ſay, choice has liberty to refuſe an object after it is choſen, is uſing violence

on terms. And the same will be the conclusion if we take the word *will*. A person is invited, by two friends to make them a visit the same afternoon, at their respective houses; he wishes to visit both, but cannot at the same time. In this circumstance, honored with both their invitations, he feels at a real loss what answer to make; both insist on his compliance, with equal earnestness, and with equal influence on his judgment and passions, he still remains without a determination. To end the affair, one of his friends says, I will go with you, this afternoon, and visit our friend, if you and he will return the visit next week. This decides in the mind of him who was first invited, as the other consents to the proposal. Now, *choice*, or *will*, is in favor of visiting according to the last proposal made. Until the man willed to go, the will to go did not exist; it could have no liberty before it did exist; and after it did, to say, that that will which was to go one way, was at liberty to go the other, is using the violence before mentioned. It is then evident, that will, or choice, has no possible liberty. The objector will now move his position, and say, it is the mind that has this liberty to chuse, or not to chuse; to will, or not to will. In order to determine this matter justly, I first ask, does the

power of chuſing exiſt in the mind, or in the object choſen ? If it be anſwered, that the power of choice is in the mind, and not in the object which influences the mind, the man who was at a loſs which of his friends to viſit, while the objects were in equal force on his mind, was entirely ignorant of it; and admitting it was ſo, it might as well have been otherwiſe, for the power of chuſing, in his mind did him no good ; he was, after all dependant on a certain circumſtance, which, being attached to one object, made it preferable to the other. Again, admitting the power of choice to be attributed to the mind, and not to the object which gives perceptions to the mind and influences it, it muſt be as eaſy for the mind to chuſe a *minor* as a *major* object. It will be granted, on all ſides, that perſons may chuſe an object in preference to another, which is not half ſo valuable ; but this is always in conſequence of error of judgment. Now it is as objects appear to the mind, that we ought to conſider them in our preſent query. Suppoſing a poor man, who has a wife and ſome hungry children to feed, is offered a dollar, or a guinea, for a day's work ; he does not know the value of either, not being acquainted with money, or its value, or the nature of the metals which are ſtamped with value. He

conſults, or means to conſult the good of thoſe for whom he is willing to labor, and would, if poſſible, receive that which would do the moſt towards removing their wants; and ſays to himſelf, the dollar is much the largeſt, and the probability is, worth three times as much as the guinea; it is finally his opinion that that is the caſe. Now I aſk in relation to my argument, which of thoſe pieces of money he will be the moſt likely to chuſe? The anſwer is, the dollar. But I aſk, why? If his mind is at *real liberty*, it is no more attached to the dollar, than the guinea; the influence which the dollar has on his mind more than the guinea, deſtroys not the *liberty* of his mind to chuſe the guinea; I wiſh to be told, why he is more likely to chuſe the dollar than the guinea. Or, to alter the ſtatement, ſo that the mind is not deceived, the man perfectly knows the value of both guinea and dollar. The good of his wanting family is what he means to conſult; which will he be moſt likely to chuſe, in this caſe? Anſwer, the guinea. I aſk, again, why? Is there any reaſon, or is there not? There is, and it is the greater value. Then, the object governs the choice. I aſk, in the above inſtance, had the mind any *power* or *liberty* to chuſe the object which appeared of the leaſt value, and refuſe that which ap-

peared of the greateſt? I am ſure there is not a perſon in the world who would ſay that it had. Again, admitting, for the ſake of the argument that the mind poſſeſſes this imaginary liberty; I then aſk, how came it to poſſeſs ſuch liberty? Anſwer, *God* gave it. Then the matter ſtands thus, *God* produced a mind, and gave it liberty to will, or chuſe, and it wills or chuſes; I aſk what is the original cauſe of this willing and chuſing? The reader will eaſily ſee, that if I grant my opponent's arguments, it will not be to his advantage. Again, for the laſt time, if God gave to man a *liberty* whereby he can chuſe or refuſe the ſame object, did he not give his creature a liberty which he did not poſſeſs himſelf? Did not the Infinitely Wiſe eternally know all that he himſelf would do? It muſt be granted. Then I aſk, again, does he poſſeſs any liberty in his nature whereby it is in his power to abandon the general ſyſtem contained in his divine omniſcience, and embrace one entirely different? I am ſure there are but few in the world who would not ſay, as did the apoſtle, "He cannot deny himſelf." If the creature poſſeſſes an ability which is not in his Creator, I would aſk, firſt, where he got it? And ſecondly, if the Almighty knew all the conſequences which would ariſe from ſuch an

ability? If the anſwer is in the negative, it argues that his wiſdom is finite and limited, and that he does not know but this *unaccountable ability* of willing and chuſing may finally deſtroy his whole plan in creation, providence and redemption! If it is granted, that he did know all the conſequences that would ariſe from this ability of willing and chuſing, which is called liberty of will, it is denying its exiſtence. For if thoſe conſequences were all *known*, it argues they were all *certain* and none of them avoidable.

Having, as I hope, to the reader's ſatisfaction, anſwered the objections in reſpect to the liberty of the will, I would again invite him back to our ſubject.

The immediate cauſes of ſin are found in our natural conſtitutions, and the moſt *diſtant* of thoſe *immediate* cauſes are the ſame as the moſt *diſtant* of the *immediate* cauſes of our *virtues;* but the moſt immediate cauſes of our virtues and our vices are extremely different. For inſtance, two men meet at an Inn; both of them have families which are in want of bread; they have each fifty cents, which they had juſt taken for their day's work. One ſays to the other, come, ſit down, and we will take ſome drink, for our comfort after a hard day's labor. The other reflects in his mind, and ſays to himſelf, to let my

children ſuffer, at home, to gratify my company in what is in indifferent to me, would be abominable, having no particular appetite for ſpirits; he, therefore, refuſes, bids his company good night, goes and purchaſes neceſſary proviſions for his family, and goes home. He has done as a virtuous honeſt huſband ought to do. The other poſſeſſes a violent appetite for ardent ſpirits; the moment he comes where it is, his want of it overpowers his love and duty to his family, the latter being at a diſtance, and the former being nigh; he calls for drink till he ſpends his fifty cents, and then goes home to his expecting family intoxicated. In this, according to the ſcriptures, though he were a profeſſed chriſtian, he is worſe than an infidel.

In the mirror preſented, the reader may ſee, that thoſe two men acted equally alike from their natural wants, appetites and paſſions. Had neither of them any wants, appetites or paſſions, neither of them would have done any thing at all. They would not have labored for the money; and if they had the money, they would not have laid it out in any way poſſible. Therefore, we ſee, that want, appetite and paſſion, in one, produced *virtue*, and in the other, *vice*. But, the ſtill more immediate cauſes were not the ſame in both perſons; and the conſequences to

them, in a moral ſenſe, differ as much, as did the moſt immediate circumſtances which produced their conduct. One felt the approbation of a good conſcience in having done what cool diſpaſſionate reaſon dictated; the other, as ſoon as his eyes are opened to ſee what he has done, is ſtruck with condemnation, for having violated the dictates of that law of prudence and equity, of which he was ſuſceptible.

A beggar influenced by hunger, calls at the door of the affluent for food, he knows it is there, his appetite is good, the *object magnifies* to his *senses;* but by one who knows the *love* of *property* more than the *want* of *food*, he is ſternly denied. The beggar proſtrates himſelf, and moves his *suit* in *language* of *distress*, reducing his *petition* to *only a piece of bread;* the covetous man is a little moved, with ſome ſmall feeling of *compassion*, but fearing that if he ſhould beſtow, he ſhould conſequently be troubled again, bids the beggar depart, and leaves him. The beggar's object was food, and his paſſion hunger; he acted up to the influence of his object, and did all in his power to obtain it. The other's object was the ſaving of his property, and his paſſion was covetouſneſs; he acted up to the influence of his object, to the gratification of his paſſion. Now, had the circumſtance been varied ſo much

as this, that he did not think his giving, at that time, would ever induce him to call again, the pobability is, his object and his paſſion would both have been different; to feed an hungry man, would have been his object, and charity his paſſion.

Man's *main* object, in all he does, is *happiness;* and were it not for that, he never could have any other particular object. What would induce men to form ſocieties; to be at the expence of ſupporting government; to acquire knowledge; to learn the ſciences, or till the earth, if they believed they could be as happy without, as with? The fact is, man would not be the being that he now is, as there would not be any ſtimulus to action; he muſt become *inert*, therefore ceaſe to be. As men are never without this grand object, ſo they are never without their wants, which render ſuch an object deſirable. But their minor objects vary, according as their underſtandings vary, and their paſſions differ. Then, ſays the objector, there is no ſuch thing as *disinterested benevolence*. I anſwer, words are uſed to communicate ideas; there is that, often, in our experience, which is meant by *disinterested benevolence*. An American is travelling in Europe; he meets in the ſtreet, a young and beautiful *fair, bathed in tears*, her *breast swoln with grief*,

and her *countenance perfectly sad.* His heart, fraught with the *keenest sensibility*, is moved compaſſionately to inquire the cauſe of her *grief;* he is informed that her father, in a late ſickneſs, became indebted to his phyſician twenty guineas, for which he was that hour committed to gaol, when he had but partially recovered his health. Our traveller no ſooner hears the ſtory, than he advances the twenty guineas to diſcharge the debt, and gives her fifty more as a reward for her generous concern. As our traveller did not expect any *pecuniary reward* either *directly*, or *indirectly*, his *charity* is called *disinterested benevolence.* But, ſtrictly ſpeaking, he was greatly *interested;* he was intereſted in the *afflictions* of *father* and *child;* their *relief* was his *object*, and *charity* his *passion.* Now did he not act for his own happineſs? Yes, as much as ever a man did in life. What muſt have been his miſery, poſſeſſing the ſame diſpoſition, without the means to relieve? And what a ſublime ſatisfaction he enjoyed, by the beſtowment of his favor! Sacred truth informs us, "It is *more blessed* to *give*, than to *receive.*"

We find ſome men honeſt and induſtrious; who think, and think juſtly, that happineſs is not to be found in any other

way. Others are indolent and knaviſh, and they expect to obtain happineſs in ſo being. But they are deceived in their objects; and will finally learn, that they muſt be what conſcience has often told them they ought to be, honeſt and juſt, in order to be happy.

The objector will ſay, to admit that our happineſs is the grand object of all we do, deſtroys the purity of religion, and reduces the whole to nothing but ſelfiſhneſs. To which, I reply, a man acting for his own happineſs, if he ſeeks it in the heavenly ſyſtem of univerſal benevolence, knowing that his own happineſs is connected with the happineſs of his fellow men, which induces him to do juſtly, and deal mercifully with all men, he is no more *ſelfish* than he ought to be. But a man acting for his own happineſs, if he ſeeks it in the *narrow circle* of *partiality* and *covetousness*, his *ſelfishness* is *irreligious* and *wicked*.

I know it is frequently contended, that we ought to love God for what he is, and not for what we receive from him; that we ought to love holineſs for holineſs' ſake, and not for any advantage ſuch a principle is to us. This is what I have often been told, but what I could never ſee any reaſon for, or propriety in. I am aſked, if I love an orange; I anſwer,

I never tafted of one; but am told, I muft love the orange for what it is! Now I afk, is it poffible for me either to like or diflike the orange, in reality, until I tafte it? Well, I tafte of it, and like it. Do you like it? fays my friend. Yes, I reply, its flavor is exquifitely agreeable. But that will not do, fays my friend; you muft not like it becaufe its tafte is agreeable, but you muft like it becaufe it is an orange. If there is any propriety in what my friend fays, it is out of my fight. A man is travelling on the fands of Arabia, he finds no water, for a number of days; the fun fcorches, and he is exceedingly dry; at laft, he finds water, and drinks, to his fatisfaction; never did water tafte half fo agreeably before. To fay, that this man loves the water becaufe it is water, and not becaufe of the advantage which he receives from it, betrays a large fhare of inconfiftency. Would not this thirfty traveller have loved the burning fand as well as he did the water, if it had tafted as agreeably, and quenched his thirft as well? The fweet Pfalmift of Ifrael faid, "O *taste*, and fee that the *Lord* is *good*" And an apoftle fays, "We love him *because he first loved us.*" What attribute do we afcribe to God, that we do not eftteem on account of its advantage to us? Juftice would have been no more likely to

be attributed to the Almighty than injustice, if it had not firſt been diſcovered that juſtice was of greater advantage to mankind than injuſtice. And ſo of power, were it of no more advantage to human ſociety than weakneſs; the latter would have been as likely to have been eſteemed an attribute of God, as the former. If wiſdom was of no greater ſervice to man than folly, it would not have been adored in the Almighty, any more than folly. If love was no more happifying to man than hatred, hatred would as ſoon have been eſteemed an attribute of God, as love.

Undoubtedly the Almighty loves, without an influential object, as it would be erroneous to ſuppoſe that an infinite being could be operated upon. He loves, becauſe his nature is to love. An apoſtle ſays, "God is love." The ſun does not ſhine becauſe our earth influences it; it is the nature of the ſun to ſhine. But all created beings love, becauſe of influential objects; & they always love according to the influence which objects have on their minds and paſſions. It ſeems, then, ſays the objector, that our vices are not to be attributed to the devil, but to the influence which objects have on our minds. Surely the reader ought to expect, that after I have denied the exiſtence of a being, I ſhould, likewiſe, deny his power. Per-

haps, however, the reader may be surprised, to find that I do not believe in the existence of a being so universally acknowledged among christian people, and which, has been of as much advantage to some, as the *Goddess Diana* was to the *craftsmen* of *Ephesus*. But I am willing to give my reasons for not believing with the multitude, in this particular. A created individual being cannot be in more than one place, at the same time. But how many millions of places must this evil angel be in, at once, in order to perform the business which christians have allotted him? In order for me to believe in such a being, I must give him the omnipresency of the Almighty, which belongs to none, in my opinion, but my Maker. Again, to admit the existence of such a being, would be of no avail, as there is nothing for him to do. There is, says the objector; he tempts men to sin. But does he tempt men contrary to their passions and the influence of their motives? Answer, no. Then the temptation is of no possible consequence. Supposing a man to be exceedingly hungry, and an agreeable meal is set before him, and he invited to refresh; at that moment the devil comes and tempts him to eat. What effect would the temptation have on the hungry man? Or, supposing, in room of

tempting him to eat, he ſhould tempt him not to eat, would he be likely to ſucceed? But what means the ſcripture, which ſpeaks of a devil? one who was a liar from the beginning, &c. I anſwer, I have no objection to believing, that there is *such a devil* as the *ſcripture ſpeaks of.* He is called the Old Serpent, and is the ſame I have deſcribed, which beguiled the woman, in the beginning; and it is the carnal mind, which is enmity againſt God. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman," ſaith the Lord, "between her ſeed and thy ſeed." An apoſtle ſays, "The fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh, that ye cannot do the things ye would." And, that this was the firſt beguiler, we may learn, from the ſcripture, which ſaith, "*Luſt*, when it conceived, brought forth ſin; and ſin, when it was finiſhed, brought forth death." An apoſtle alſo ſays, "When a man is *tempted*, he is *drawn away* with his own *luſts* and *enticed.* Any perſon who is wholly dictated by a fleſhly mind, may juſtly be called a *devil*, as in the caſe of Judas and Peter. As our Lord ſaid to the Jews, alſo, "Ye are of your *father*, the *devil;* and the *luſts* of your father, ye will do." But, ſays the objector, do you think our Saviour was tempted by the *powers* of the *fleſh*, when it is ſaid, he is

tempted by the *devil?* I aſk, in my turn, for what is this particular circumſtance introduced? If we cannot prove, from our own experience, that we are tempted by ſome other being than our own fleſhly appetites, would it be any thing more than a ſpeculative belief, to admit another tempter? But, ſays the objector, that does not anſwer the queſtion. Then let us look at his temptations; when he hungered, he was tempted; by what? and to what? Anſwer, by hunger, to turn ſtones into bread. Here was a fleſhly appetite. When he had a view of all the kingdoms of the earth, and their worldly glory, he was *tempted to avail himself of them.* Here was *natural ambition*, ſuch as gave riſe to the victories of an Alexander. When on the pinnacle of the temple, he was tempted to caſt himſelf down, as it was written concerning him, that God will give his angels charge over him, &c. Here was that paſſion which gives riſe to preſumption, and wiſhes to avoid duty. But it is ſaid, the *devil taketh him about*, thus and ſo; not literally, however, for there is no mountain in the *world* that commands a *proſpect* of but a *ſmall part* of the *kingdoms* of the *world.* The *exceeding high mountain* on which our Redeemer ſtood, when he ſaw all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them,

was the mountaim of *human pride*. Remember, when a perſon is *on* a mountain, the mountain is *beneath his feet*. So was this mountain of *human pride beneath the feet* of our ſinleſs Redeemer; but, at the ſame time, it gave him a proſpect of all which the world calls great and glorious. In a word, the ſcripture informs us, that he was tempted in all points, as we are, yet without ſin. If, therefore, we know how we are tempted, we know, alſo, how he was tempted. It is a ſentiment of mine, that we ought not to argue that for truth, in matters of this nature, which we have no knowledge of, by experience.

Having illuſtrated the original cauſe, and the ſecondary cauſes of ſin, I paſs to take notice of its conſequences.

In order to have our work plain before us, I obſerve, Sin is the fruits of the fleſh, which are oppoſed to that true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. And St. Paul ſays, they are manifeſt. See Gal. v. 19. 20, 21. "Now the works of the fleſh are manifeſt, which are theſe, adultery, fornication, uncleanneſs, laſciviouſneſs, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, ſtrife, ſeditions, hereſies, envying, murders, drunkenneſs, revellings, and ſuch like." Theſe are the ſins which our fleſhly minds are daily producing, and their conſequen-

ces are witneſſed by a miſerable world. By theſe ſins, with their aſſociates, mankind are rendered miſerable indeed. Social and domeſtic happineſs is frequently deſtroyed. *Cold* and *cruel jealousy* murders the ſoft and tender paſſions of love, as Cain ſlew his brother. A garden, encloſed by the walls of fidelity, decked with the flowers of innocence, watered with the living ſtreams of love, teaming with fruits of richeſt repaſt, and adorned with the vine of future proſpects, is laid waſte in an hour. Jealouſy, like a foe bent on plunder, flung down the wall, dried up the ſtream, and like a devouring worm, gnawed the vine, that it periſhed; the flowers droop, and the fruits wither away. Nothing remains but ſome faint veſtiges of what is ruined, ſerving as evidence of the melancholy truth, that ſin has found its way to this once happy place.

Idolatry is the ſin of worſhiping that, which is not, in reality, the true God. The Old Serpent could never long hold the creature in captivity, if he did not allow him a God to worſhip, and religious duties to amuſe him. I have already argued, that man is of heavenly extraction, that he is related to his Maker, is a dependent being; and, therefore, to worſhip, is perfectly natural to him. Then, in or-

der for the carnal mind to take the lead of the whole man, it must introduce a god to be worshipped, and religious duties, whereby this god may be pleased, and make the creature believe, that this god is the true God, and that those religious duties are of the genuine kind. But this god will surely possess all the vile passions of the old man, Adam, and those religious duties must consist in certain rites, which bear no relation to *heaven-born charity*, or *deeds of kindness*. An Almighty, omnipresent, infinitely wise and good, may be talked of; but his wisdom, power and goodness, must be denied; and he must be a great many millions of miles off, fixed to a certain place, yet every where present; infinitely wise and powerful, yet suffers an everlasting violation of his will; possessed of infinite wisdom, yet, is disappointed in his plans; loves some of his creatures, and hates others; is pleased and displeased with the conduct of his creatures; is perfectly unchangeable, yet loves, at one time, and, at another, hates the same object. Such an idol will answer for thousands. Now what are the consequences? Answer, one nation supposes itself the only favorite of God; other people are haters of him, and hated by him. If my God hates those who hate him, I ought to do as my God does, and

I will hate them too. One denomination of christians has different ideas of the attributes of their God from another; they are violently opposed to each other; they are at *swords' points;* they call each other heretics, and doom each other to the *endless wrath* of their *God!* All such religion is of the flesh; the wisdom of it is not from above, but it is earthly, sensual and devilish, and those who possess it are *tormented day* and *night* with it. Reader, turn over the pages of history, calculate the rivers of blood which have been shed on account of religious disputes, and ask yourself the question, is this religion worthy of a Supreme Being? The devil will have religion, & will have it maintained as long as he can; but then, he must tell the people that it is none of his, but that it came from the true and living God, or they will not believe it. It is an object with the Old Serpent, to have a great many denominations, and to persuade them that they are *individually right*, and *individually wrong*, and to stir up their minds to maintain their respective tenets, and to wage war with each other, which he calls *contending correctly for the faith.* Many who profess to be called by Him who loved sinners, to preach his gospel, and who pretend to follow the Saviour, in the path of meekness, if they happen to think a lit-

tle different, in matters of faith, they are filled with the greateſt vehemency towards each other, which they call holy wrath, or indignation; and you might as well reaſon with hungry lions, or tigers, as with them, for they worſhip the *beast* and they partake largely of his nature. Did they worſhip the true God, in the ſpirit of the heavenly man, difference, in particular ſentiments, would not hinder their fellowſhip, and love one to another. All the religion in our world, founded on the *partial principles of man's inventions*, pointing out particular modes of faith, and forms of worſhip, is from the carnal man. Diſcord and contention enſue; wars and fightings are the conſequences; hatred, wrath, ſtrife, emulation, and rivalſhip, rage in the minds of thoſe who poſſeſs this ſpurious religion. What I ſay is a truth of univerſal notoriety; and yet, what is very ſtrange, is, people are not convinced of it. As if a *monstrous wolf* ſhould ravage, in *open day light*, in the high and low parts of the ſhepherd's paſture, gorging his carnivorous appetite with the blood and fat of the flock; and the ſhepherd thinks it is all well, becauſe ſomebody, on whoſe ſleeve he pins his faith, has told him that, that creature is a ſheep, and that it will do no harm! How miſerable has religion made mankind! But,

ſays the reader, it was ſin that you were to tell the conſequences of, not religion. I tell you, kind reader, that the religion of which I ſpeak, is oppoſed to every degree of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, which has ever been revealed to mankind, and, therefore, is ſin ; and that which is attended with the moſt pernicious conſequences. It is this kind of religion which takes away the "key of knowledge ;" its votaries neither enter the kingdom of heaven themſelves, nor ſuffer thoſe to enter who would. All worſhip, which is dictated by modes and forms, as inventions of men, is oppoſed to the true worſhip. "The Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him, who worſhip him in *ſpirit* and in *truth*." Nothing ſuits the *carnal mind better than religion ;* but it muſt be a child of her own, and muſt look juſt like herſelf. The carnal mind being the hotbed where all the roots of bitterneſs grow which trouble mankind, we ought to look here, for the foundation of all that religion which bears, the features of the ſerpent. *Pride* is the moſt *prominent characteriſtic* of a fleſhly mind, its religion dictates to look with contempt on thoſe who are not in the ſame mode of faith, who do not ſubſcribe to the ſame articles of belief, and are not called by the ſame

denomination; and says, "Stand by, thyself, come not nigh me, for I am holier than thou." It dictates for giving thanks for not being like others; it boasts of performances wrought with great pains & expense; it boasts of having "borne the burden and heat of the day," and dictates to expect more than others receive: 'But the carnal mind,' says the reader, 'makes no use of the scriptures, does it?' Always, besure, where it is fashionable to believe them, and men are *despised*, if they do not. Any thing will do, of which the creature is proud, and is willing to *persecute* others for not adopting. But ought not men to be despised, and called all to naught, who do not believe the Bible to be the word of God? The Old Serpent will answer, yes, where it suits his turn best; but the spirit of Christ answers, no, in *all cases*. If the scriptures *are not the word of God*, men ought not to be *despised* for not believing them; and if they are, they ought not to be *despised* but *pitied* and *enlightened*. Remember, our acceptable *High Priest* was one who could "have compassion on the ignorant, and them who are out of the way." Emulation, or rivalship, is one of the works of the flesh, and it is enmity against the meek and humble spirit of Christ; and its consequences are pernicious beyond descrip-

tion. In matters called religion, we see much of this iniquity, as well as in natural things. One denomination wishes to rival another; one preacher wishes to rival another; and how often is it the case, that professed christians will act more underhandedly, to obtain an advantage over a professor of a different denomination, than a common *jockey* is willing to do, in order to obtain a bargain. And I will say more, I have often seen, in the same churches, persons at such variance, about matters of their religion, that truth seemed not to be regarded, in the least, on either side; each would strive to *crush his brother*, until two parties were formed, and a whole town set in an uproar. This is the religion which pleases the carnal mind, but it is death. One nation looks with an envious eye on the increasing wealth and population of another. She forms a *subterfuge*, as a *pretext* for *declaring war* against her neighbor, by which the two nations are drawn into a contention; a long war ensues, bringing horrors, to describe which, would swell a volume to an enormous size. Look on France and England, this moment, and for many years back. Who could calculate one half the miseries produced from the spirit of rivalship between these potent rivals. How many brave youth have fallen a sacrifice to am-

bition; how oft has the ground drunk copious draughts of human blood; the *bosom* of the *deep* been *reddened* with the *gore* of the *slain;* and Sharks and Sea Dogs fed on the sons of mourning fathers and weeping mothers: while the leaders of this calamity make high professions of the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, and are frequently sending out their proclamations for fasts, and for prayers to Almighty God, to assist them in human butchery! "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not even from your lusts, which war against the soul?" It is recorded in the scriptures, that the *love* of money is the root of all evil. But men would have no love for money, were it not for the earthly advantages obtained by it. Then, the passion is covetousness, and the consequence is mischievous to mankind. One, for the sake of money, will steal, another will lie, another counterfeit the currency, and another will murder. Were it not for the sake of property, would men do these things? Answer, no. Then, in relation to what I have before argued, I ask, would men be industrious, were it not for the sake of property? Answer, no; then the case is plain, that they both act from the same *main passion*, which is want, and to the same *main object*, which is happiness.

But their minor objects and their minor paſſions vary. What need would there be of government, were it not for ſin? If all were willing to do, as they would be done by, what an enormous expence would be ſaved; as it would render governmental laws uſeleſs. But by reaſon of men's paſſions, and miſtaken objects influencing them, our lives are expoſed to be taken by our neighbors, our property pillaged, our hard earnings wrung by violence away, and our midnight ſlumbers interrupted by banditti, and, in ſhort, all that is dear to us, to be taken from our enjoyment. "He, who loveth not his brother, is a murderer." Are not all men murderers? do they not ſometimes experience the lack of brotherly love? This murderous paſſion is ſin, it is oppoſed to the language of the heavenly man in the mind; but what are its conſequences? Every one endeavors to ſupplant his brother; no one is ſafe, in his feelings, while he is in the hands of his brother. When this paſſion reigns, all the tender charities of humanity are ſuppreſſed; all the *bowels* of *compassion* are *frozen;* a deaf ear is turned to the *cries* and *calls* of the *needy* in *distress;* the poor are deſpiſed by the rich, and the rich are envied by the poor; parents are diſhonored by their children; children are abuſed, and pro-

voked to anger by their parents. The vile affections of sin will burn to the destruction of the sweetest harmonies of nature; the *whitest robes of innocence* are *stained* with *indelible crimson;* the soul is drowned in the *black waters* of *iniquity* and the whole mind, with every faculty, is *plunged* into the *hell* of moral *death.*

Yet, listen to the worst of torments, in consequence of sin. "A wounded conscience, who can bear? A *fire* that burns all the day long, a sword that continually pierceth the soul, a sting that cant exhaust its poison, a fever that never turns till the patient dies. "*A dart struck through his liver.*" What ails the sinner? why his hand on his breast? There gnaws the worm that never dies, there burns the fire that is never quenched. A consciousness of guilt destroys all the *expected* comforts, and pleasures of sin. How strange it is, that after a thousand disappointments in succession, men are not discouraged. O sin! how you paint your face; how you flatter us, poor mortals, on to death; you never appear to the sinner in your true character; you make us fair promises, but you never fulfiled one; your tongue is smoother than oil, but the poison of asps is under your lips; you have impregnated all our passions with the venom of your poison; you have spread gloomy

darkneſs over the whole region of the ſoul; you have endeavored, with your ſtupefactive poiſon, to blunt the ſword in the hands of the cherubims, which, for your ſake, keeps us from the tree of life.

A miſtaken idea has been entertained of ſin, even by profeſſors. I have often heard ſincere miniſters preach, in their reproofs to their hearers, that it was the greateſt folly in the world, for people to forego ſalvation, in a future ſtate, for the *comforts* and *pleasures* of *sin* in this. Such exhortations really defeat their intentions. The wiſh of the honeſt preacher is, that the wicked ſhould repent of their ſins, and do better; but, at the ſame time, he indicates, that ſin, at preſent, is more productive of happineſs than righteouſneſs; but that the bad will come in another world; that although *doing well* is a *hard way*, yet, its advantages will be great, in another ſtate. Juſt as much as any perſon thinks ſin to be more happifying than righteouſneſs, he is ſinful; his heart eſteems it, though, in ſome poſſible caſes, for fear of the loſs of ſalvation in the world to come, he may abſtain from ſome outward enormities; yet his heart is full of the deſire of doing them. A thief paſſes a merchant's ſhop, wiſhes to ſteal ſome of his goods, but durſt not, for fear of apprehenſion and punniſhment. Is this man leſs a

thief, at *heart*, for not actually taking the goods? I have been told, by persons of *high professions in christianity*, that if they were certain of salvation in the world to come, they *would commit every sin*, to which their *unbridled passions* might lead them; even from the lips of some who *profess to preach the righteousness of Christ*, have I heard such-like expressions! I do not mention these things to cast reflections on any person, or denomination in the world; for I have a favorable hope, that there are some, in all denominations, who are not so deceived; but I mention them, in order to show how deceiving sin is, to the mind. It is as much the nature of sin, to torment the mind, as it is the nature of fire to burn our flesh. Sin deprives us of every rational enjoyment, so far as it captivates the mind; it was never able to furnish one drop of cordial for the soul; her tender mercies are cruelty, and her *breasts* of *consolation* are *gall* and *wormwood*. Sin is a false mirror, by which the sinner is deceived in every thing on which his mind contemplates. If he thinks of his Maker, who is his best friend, it strikes him with awe, fills his mind with fearful apprehensions, and he wishes there was no such being. If he thinks of any duty which he owes his Maker, he says, in a moment, God is a hard master,

why ſhould he require of me what is ſo contrary to my happineſs? Religion is only calculated to make men miſerable; righteouſneſs blunts my paſſions, and deprives me of pleaſures for which I long.—But it repreſents ſtolen waters to be ſweet, and bread eaten in ſecret to be pleaſant." In a word, ſin is of a torment-giving nature to every faculty of the ſoul, and is the moral death of the mind.

Well, ſays the reader, can ſin have all thoſe evil effects, and not be *infinite?*—Undoubtedly, as all thoſe evil effects are experienced in this finite ſtate. Thouſands, who, I hope, are gone to greater degrees of reſt, than the moſt upright enjoy here, were once tormented with ſin, were once under the dominion of the carnal mind. The effects of ſin, as ſin, are not endleſs, but limited to the ſtate in which it is committed. This, perhaps, will be contrary to the opinion of many who read this treatiſe, as they are wont to ſuppoſe, that there are *three cardinal conſequences* produced by ſin, viz. *Death temporal*, *death ſpiritual*, and *death eternal.*

As to the firſt of theſe conſequences, I think I have plainly refuted it. Men die natural deaths, becauſe they are naturally mortal; but they are not mortal be-

cauſe of ſin, for man was mortal before he ſinned; if he was not, he never could have ſinned. My opponent will ſay, that the death of the body is the conſequence of ſin, when one man murders another; to which I reply, one man could not murder another, if men were not mortal. Sin cannot be ſaid to be the cauſe of natural death, any more than of natural life. I will acknowledge that ſin is often the mean whereby natural life is ended, and my oppoſer muſt acknowledge, that it is often the mean of perſons being introduced into natural life. Perhaps an hundred are introduced into exiſtence by illicit connexions, where one is taken out by malice prepence. But the meaning of the objector is, that man became mortal by ſin; to which I reply, if immortality is corruptible by ſin, the chriſtian hope of immortality is a vain one. The death which Adam died, in conſequence of ſin, happened on the day of tranſgreſſion, if we may believe the ſcripture account about it; but Adam did not die a natural death, on that day, nor for ſome hundreds of years afterwards.

The way in which many have tried to reconcile the ſcriptures with their traditions, in this matter, appears ſtrange to me; they quote 2 Peter, iii, 8. "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing,

that one day with the Lord, is as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day ;" and as Adam died ſhort of a thouſand years, he died in the day of tranſgreſſion. But, in order for the text to read to their meaning, it ought to read thus, "One day with the Lord *is* a thouſand years, and a thouſand years *is* one day ;" as they underſtand the text, the conjunction *as* has no poſſible meaning. In reſpect to *ſpiritual death*, I believe it was all that was meant by the word, "*in* the *day* thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die." But, if *eternal death* was alſo intended, there was no recovery for man. Why divines have carried this matter ſo erroneouſly beyond all ſcripture tenets, I cannot imagine. But it is ſaid, ſpiritual or moral death would be eternal, were it not for the diſpenſation of the goſpel, by which death is ſwallowed up of life. So we might ſay of any thing elſe, even of a momentary nature ; it would be eternal, if it were never to end. The days of a man's life would be *eternal*, if they were never to end. The ſpring would be *eternal*, if it were not ſucceeded with the ſummer. A roſe would be an eternal flower, if it never withered. And youth would be *eternal*, if it were not for old age and death. But what do all ſuch arguments avail ? The grand, ſublime and

glorious syſtem of God, carries every thing away that has its birth from mortality and time.

I have already hinted, that ſin might have conſequences which were not evil, but not as ſin. By the infinite wiſdom and goodneſs of the Almighty, ſin may be of advantage even to the ſinner himſelf; but I ſay again, not as ſin. If the infinitely Wiſe and Good intended any one thing for good, which we rightly call ſin, that event, in reſpect to the divine intention, is not ſin. I have introduced a circumſtance, in the fore part of this work, in which, what I am now endeavoring to illuſtrate, may clearly be ſeen. It is evident that, that which Joſeph's brethren meant unto evil, God meant unto good. Now the immediate conſequences of their ſin, to them, was guilt of the firſt magnitude. Who could calculate the one half of what they endured, in conſequence of the wrong which they had done? But the conſequences which God intended, in the iſſue of the event, were altogether beneficial; and thoſe who committed the ſin, by the mercy of God, were made the partakers of the benefits contained in the purpoſe of him who meant it for good.

Again, it is evident from the ſcriptures, that Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, were gathered

together againſt Jeſus, to do what the council and the hand of the Almighty had determined to be done. See Acts iv. 27, 28. Had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, any better meaning, in crucifying Chriſt, than Joſeph's brethren had, in ſelling Joſeph to the Iſhmaelites? All who read the queſtion, will anſwer, no. But the ſacred text ſays, they were gathered together to do whatſoever *God's hand* and *council* had *determined* to be done. Now I aſk, was not the determination of the murderers of Chriſt, the ſame with the determination of Divine Wiſdom? Says the reader, I cannot ſay it was not, and yet, I dare not ſay it was. I will then anſwer, the Almighty intended all they did, ſhould be done; but he intended it for a very different purpoſe from what they did, who did it. They intended the *deſtruction* and *overthrow* of the *doctrine* which Chriſt preached, and they hoped the things which he had ſpoken, concerning them, would fail of taking place. But the means which they uſed to oppoſe the cauſe of Chriſt, were thoſe with which God intended to promote it. They miſſed of their intentions, and the Lord carried the whole of his into effect. What chriſtian is there in the world, who will

fay, the conſequences of the death of Chriſt are not good? or, that thoſe who were his murderers, for whom he *prayed* on the *croſs*, will not receive an advantage from his death, which they meant for evil? Or, who can *limit* the good contained in the deſigns of the Almighty? But will this rule do, ſays the reader to apply to all ſin? I anſwer, without heſitancy, that I fully believe it. Food for the body would never pleaſe the appetite, unleſs we firſt experienced hunger; the cooling ſpring would not be ſought for, if men were never thirſty; health could never be prized, could we not contraſt it with ſickneſs; eaſe is appreciated by the remembrance of pain; and a phyſician would never be wanted, if it were not for our infirmities; a Saviour would never have been praiſed by his redeemed, had they never been in bondage; the ſong, "*Thou haſt redeemed us to God*, out of *every kingdom* and *nation*," could never be ſung, had redemption not been needed; a fountain would never have been opened, for Judah and Jeruſalem to waſh in, from ſin and uncleanneſs, had it not been for ſin and uncleanneſs. Then, ſays my opponent, we may do evil, that good may come. This objection has often been ſtated to me, in converſation on this ſubject. My reply is ſhort. There is a ſelf-contradiction in

the objection ; to do any thing whatever, for good, is not a moral tranſgreſſion. Had Joſeph's brethren been taught of God, that it was neceſſary for them to ſell Joſeph to the Iſhmaelites, that he might go down to Egypt, and there prepare for the famine, and they had done it, for the good which God intended, it would have been no more ſin, in them, than there was in the deſign of God. Then it is plain, that to do evil, that good may come, is impoſſible.

Again, had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, intended the good which God intended, in the crucifixion of Chriſt, *sin* would have been out of the queſtion. St. Paul aſks the queſtion to his oppoſers, after he had argued, that, *where sin abounded, grace* did *much more abound*, "Shall we continue in ſin, that grace may abound?" And anſwers it thus, *God* forbid. How ſhall we, who are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? If we are truly enlightened into the nature of the all-abounding grace of the goſpel, it cauſes us to die to ſin ; and if we are *dead* to *sin*, we ſhall not *live* in it. God has forbidden it, in the nature of things, and rendered it impoſſible.

As I have limited ſin in its nature, the reader will not expect to find unlimited conſequences attached to it, in this work.

Were it so, that the fullness of the divine law was perfectly comprehended in the mind of the creature, and he should go contrary thereto, his sin would then be as infinite as the law transgressed; but I argue, that the law transgressed, is a law formed in the mind of an imperfect being, by the imperfect knowledge which he obtains of the divine law, which is no other than God himself. This knowledge being imperfect, forms a law like itself, imperfect and mutable; and an imperfect mutable law does not afford data, from which to argue endless consequences. The sacred oracle declares, "the soul that sins shall die:" If it had added and said, "and shall *never live again*," it would have carried the consequences of sin infinitely farther than the Holy Ghost intended. Sin is death to the soul, as long as it sins, be that time longer or shorter. In order to argue an endless consequence, we must first state an infinite case; and as I have argued sin on a finite scale, and in a limited circle, I must rationally limit its consequences.

I will now state two particulars, which the reader will find argued in the course of this work, state my oponent's objections against them, answer those objections, and introduce my second general inquiry, by stating a third objection.

1. Man is dependant, in all his volitions, and moves by neceſſity.

2. The Almighty has a *good intention* in every volition of man.

Objection first. If man moves by neceſſity, why do the ſcriptures abound with exhortations and admonitions to diſſuade from ſin, and ſo many inducements to perſuade to holineſs and virtue? And why are there requirements in the law, to which man is under the neceſſity of going contrary?

Objection 2d. If God has a good intention in every action or volition of man, why is it ſaid, in the ſcriptures, that he is grieved and provoked with us? &c.

The propoſition, againſt which the firſt objection ſtands, anſwers the objection, in all its parts. It was in the ſyſtem of divine wiſdom, that man ſhould experience a conſciouſneſs of ſin and guilt, without which the ſubject of my inquiry could never have exiſted. If ſin and guilt had never beeen introduced into our ſyſtem, the plan of grace, by atonement, could never have been exhibited. Sin and guilt could never have exiſted, providing there had been no prohibition communicated to the intelligent mind; and, on the other hand, if the mind poſſeſſed as much liberty to go contrary to inducements, as it does inclination to follow them, induce-

ments would have no possible effect; exhortations, admonitions, and warnings, would be of no possible service.

If God purposed that man should come to a knowledge of his own infirmities in the way that he does, he must have intended all the means whereby the purpose might be accomplished. And if he designed that any degree of moral holiness should be found on earth, such inducements must influence the minds of men, which would necessarily produce it. That God does, in a strict sense of speaking, require more of any of his creatures than they are able to perform, is inconsistent with the dictates of good reason, and destitute of scripture authority; and has no better foundation for its support, than an idea that darkness originates in the sun, or light in an opaque body. But does not God require perfect holiness in man? Does he not command strict obedience, to every jot and tittle of his law?

I have before argued, that the spirit of God's law, in its infinite fullness, was above the capacity of man in a finite state, in which he was made subject to vanity; and that it was the shadow of the law only that was introduced to the creature's understanding, and that for the purpose, that the *offence* might abound. Then, says my opponent, if you are correct, in

this ſtatement, does it not prove that the requirement is more than the abilities of the creature can perform? And how can the difficulty be removed?

The ſubject now in queſtion, is a query, on which, many religious diſputes have ariſen, and much difference of ſentiments reſted. Two grand parties, in Chriſtendom, have been formed by it; and thoſe two have ſubdivided, according to their different modes of ſolving, thoſe difficulties, to which they have been driven by their antagoniſts.

Some have contended, that in the beginning, man was poſſeſſed of ſufficient ability to have kept the law of his Maker perfectly; but, that he loſt that ability, by tranſgreſſion; and, that neither Adam, nor his poſterity, was ever able to retrieve it; but, although man has loſt his ability to obey, God has not loſt his right to command. This has appeared to many, to be ſound argument.

Suppoſing Government had an occaſion for raiſing an army, and ſhould command a cripple to bear arms, and endure fatigue; The poor cripple deſires conſideration, on account of his infirmities but is told, that his father crippled him, in infancy, which, if he had not done, he would now have been able to endure fatigue; but, as his father did him this piece of miſ-

chief, in his infancy, he muſt, and ought to comply with impoſſibilities, on pain of death! This has juſt the ſame appearance of *ſound reaſon* as the other.

Others have endeavored to ſolve this matter, by placing a *total inability* in the *will* of the creature; arguing that no ability is wanting but a willingneſs, &c. They admit, at the ſame time, that the power of altering the will, does not belong to the creature. Theſe argue, that this *inability* is *criminality*. I have already ſhown, that will is a conſequence ariſing from our perceptions of objects, which proves, if our underſtanding were perfect, our will would be ſo. The criminality, therefore, might be placed on the underſtanding, as well as on the will. The reader will obſerve, that I am ſpeaking of criminality, which is ſuppoſed to be ſeen by the All-wiſe, in his creatures. It certainly cannot be a default, for the reader to ſee, that there is as much inability in the *underſtanding*, as there is in the *will*, when a man is ſo much deceived, as to think it more for his happineſs to be diſhonest, than to be governed by the principles of integrity.

Others ſay, Adam loſt his ability to obey, by tranſgreſſion, but that God reſtored it again, by the Mediator, and man poſſeſſes it now, as a gift of God, through

Chriſt; and argue, that it is in the power of man to keep the law of God perfectly. If this is the caſe, it ſeems that it might as well have been otherwiſe, as there is not a juſt man on earth, who liveth and ſinneth not. All who argue this idea, acknowledge that they have been ſinners; and indeed, if they did not, they would have no part nor lot, in the ſon of Jeſſe.

Let us now ſtate fairly, this *gordian-knot*, and ſee if we can find a *truth* that will cut it. If it ſtands in a plain contradiction in words, it will the better expoſe its difficulties, and we ſhall the better know how to attack it. I will ſtate it thus, God requires of man what he *cannot* perform; *all* that God requires of man, man *can* perform: And now for the *truth* that will *ſhine to illuminate ſo dark a place*. Obſerve, with attention; God's *holy*, *juſt*, and *infinitely perfect law*, ſtands in the *eternal conſtitution* of the *heavenly man*, the *ſecond Adam*, the *Lord* from *heaven*; it requires *perfect holineſs* in *Chriſt*, the *Mediator*, who is the *Lord*, our righteouſneſs. And in him, we are able to fulfil all righteouſneſs, and ſtand unaccuſed and uncondemned. I ſay more, we have never violated that perfect law of holineſs, in the heavenly nature, but have fulfilled all it required.

But we are *unable* to fulfil thofe divine requirements in our *carnal*, or *old man*. I have already hinted, that perfect wifdom and knowledge were neceffary, in order to fulfil a perfect law. And it is in *Chrift alone*, that we find all the *treasures of wisdom and knowledge ;* in him, we poffefs every ability, to keep the law of God perfectly ; but in the earthly Adam, we have not one fingle faculty, that is fit for fo holy a fervice.

I may now venture to ftate more contradictions. I am a fool ; and yet, I am wife. I am weak ; and yet, I am ftrong. I am impure ; and yet, I am pure. I am unholy ; and yet, I am holy. I am condemned ; and yet, I am juftified. I am a veffel of difhonor ; and yet, I am a veffel of glory. I am dead ; and yet, I live. I have loft my life ; and yet, I have gained it. I fell, in the field of battle ; and yet, gained the victory. I am a perifhable worm of the duft ; and yet, an immortal fpirit.

When the Lord gave the tables of the covenant to Mofes, on the *Mount*, he went down to the children of Ifrael, found them worfhipping the calf which Aaron had made, and being angry thereat, *broke* the *tables* which he had received. The Lord again called Mofes to the Mount, & gave him other tables, and gave orders for

them to be depoſited in the ark of the covenant, where they were preſerved. By this, we are taught the unſafety of the law, in our hands, in the earthly nature, & its ſafety in Chriſt, the heavenly.

I come to take notice of the ſecond objection. There are many paſſages of ſcripture, which repreſent the Almighty as poſſeſſing irritable paſſions, like his creatures. We are told, that it repented him that he had made man on the earth, and that it *grieved* him at the *heart*. Theſe expreſſions are as ſtrong, in their indications of *changeability* as any that might be choſen. An apoſtle exhorts, not to *grieve* the *Holy Spirit*; and it is not unfrequent that God is provoked to *anger* and *jealousy*, according to ſcripture. My opponent will not argue, that we ought to underſtand thoſe ſcriptures as *ſtrictly* and *literally* true; no man, in his ſenſes, can believe them ſo, and yet believe the Almighty unchangeable. Suppoſing my opponent ſhould give his own opinion of this queſtion; I have no doubt but he would remove the objection, to all intents. I underſtand thoſe ſcriptures, as many others do to be ſpoken according to the dark underſtanding of man, who is ignorant of the real character of God; and according to the repreſentations made by the law to the unreconciled mind. To admit, in a

ſtrict ſenſe of ſpeaking, that *God* was ever *grieved* to the *heart*, for what he did himſelf, or for what his creatures do, is more than I can do, and believe in the perfections of a Supreme Being. St. James ſays, With God there is no *variableness* nor *ſhadow of turning*. This expreſſion is as ſtrong an indication of the *unchangeability* of the Almighty, as any that might be choſen. St. Paul informs us that God works *all things* after the council of his own will. Our being led by a carnal and fleſhly mind, is undoubtedly what the apoſtle meant, by *grieving* the *Holy Spirit*; as the motions or vibrations of the carnal man are oppoſed to thoſe of the heavenly; but that the eternal Spirit of God ever felt *grief*, is more than we can rationally admit, as that would reduce the Almighty to a ſtate of ſuffering. It is very evident, that the ſcriptures repreſent the Almighty in extremely different characters; and I confeſs, I cannot reconcile them in any other way, than by the two covenants, or what is the ſame, fleſh and ſpirit. Our ideas of God, while under the legal diſpenſation, walking in fleſhly minds, are conſonant to that character which the ſcripture repreſents our Creator in, as wrathful, filled with indignation towards us for our ſins, and every day angry. Thoſe ideas which the mind entertains of the Fa-

ther of all mercies, when enlightened by the ſpirit of the new man, and while walking in the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, which maketh free from the law of ſin, are altogether conſonant to that endearing character given in ſcripture, of our *Father* who is in *heaven*, who cauſeth his ſun to ſhine on the *evil*, and on the *good;* and ſendeth rain upon the *juſt*, and upon the *unjuſt;* who loved us *while we were yet enemies*, and ſent his Son to die, in atteſtation of his love to his creatures; who is good unto all, & whoſe tender mercies are over all the works of his hands; who is of one mind and changeth not.

Says my opponent, if the Almighty governs all the affairs of mankind, according to his own appointment; if he is never diſappointed; ſuffers no violation of will; but does, in all things, and by all things, maintain and ſupport his own eternal ſyſtem of divine goodneſs, what room do we find, for the *neceſſity* of *atonement*, whereby *peace* is *made* by the *blood* of the *croſs?*

By this queſtion I come to my ſecond general ſubject, viz.

ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

In my inquiries on this momentous ſubject, I ſhall, Firſt, examine three doc

trinal tenets on atonement; from which, I shall beg leave to dissent, and give my reasons therefor.

Secondly, Show the necessity of atonement, and where satisfaction must be made.

Thirdly, Inquire into the personage and character of the Mediator, who makes the atonement, and his ability to perform the work.

Fourthly, Of Atonement in its nature.

Christian divines, in general, have agreed, in supposing sin to be an *infinite evil*, being a violation of an *infinite law*, and, therefore, that the law required an *infinite sacrifice*; short of which, no atonement could be made; that the transgression of Adam brought the whole human race into the same situation of sin and misery, and subjected them all to the *infinite penalty* an *infinite law*, which they had violated in their parent, before they individually existed.

After the above agreement, many different roads are taken; and divines of the greatest abilities, and of the first rank among the literati, have drained the last faculty of invention, in plodding through the dark regions of metaphysics, to bring up a *Samuel* to explain the *solicism* of *satisfying* an *infinite dissatisfaction*.

The plan of redemption, as held by many, may be reduced to the following compendium. God, from all eternity, foreseeing that man would sin, provided a Mediator for a certain part of his posterity, who should suffer the penalty of the law for them, and that these elect ones, chosen by God from the rest of mankind, will alone be benefited by the atonement; that, in order that the sacrifice might be adequate to the crime, for which, the sinner was condemned to *everlasting*, or endless sufferings, God himself, assumed a body of flesh and blood, such as the delinquent was constituted in, and suffered the penalty of the law by death, and arose from the dead. By this process, the demand of the law was completely answered, & the debt due to Divine Justice by the elect, was fully and amply paid. But that this atonement does not affect those who were not elected as objects of mercy, but that they are left, to suffer *endlessly* for what Adam did, before they were born. It is true, they are a little cautious about saying, that *God himself absolutely died!* But they say, that Christ, who was crucified was *really God himself*, which must, in effect, amount to the same thing. And in fact, if the Infinite did not suffer death, the whole plan fails, for it is by an *infinite sacrifice* that

they pretend to *satisfy* an *infinite dissatisfaction.*

Why the above ideas should ever have been imbibed, by men of understanding and study, I can but scarcely satisfy myself; their absurdities are so glaring, that it seems next to impossible, that men of sobriety and sound judgment should ever imbibe them, or avoid seeing them.

I have already sufficiently refuted the idea of an infinite sin, which opens to a plain path, in which the mind may run & run clear of all those perplexities which have served to confuse, rather than enlighten mankind.

If sin be not infinite, the dissatisfaction occasioned by sin is not infinite; therefore, an infinite sacrifice is not required. But, for sake of illustration, we will, for a moment, admit, that the doctrine of atonement stands on the ground over which we have just gone. I will state it, as it is often stated by those who believe it, which is by the likeness of debt and credit. The sinner owed a debt to Divine Justice, which he was unable to discharge; the Divine Being cannot, consistently with his honor, dispense with the pay, but says, I must have what is my due; but as the debtor has not ability to pay the smallest fraction, Divine Wisdom lays a deep concerted mysterious plan for the debt to be dis-

charged. And how was it? Why, for God to pay it himself!

My neighbor owes me an hundred pounds; time of payment comes, and I make a demand for my dues. Says my neighbor, my misfortunes have been such, that I am not the possessor of the smallest fraction of property in the world; and as much as I owe you, I am worse than nothing. I declare to him, positively, that I will not lose so much as a fraction of the interest, and leave him. A friend calls, and asks me how I succeeded in obtaining my dues of my neighbor; I reply, my neighbor is not, nor will he ever be able to pay me any part of my demand. My friend says, he is sorry that I should lose the debt. I answer, I shall not lose it. I have very fortunately, in my meditations on the subject, thought of a method, by which I can avail myself of the whole, to my full satisfaction; and I think it is a method which no person in the world, but myself, could ever have discovered. My friend is curious, and impatient to know the mighty secret, never before found out. The reader may guess his confusion, on my telling him, that, as I have that sum already by me, I am now going to pay up the obligation, before the interest is any larger! This has been called the gospel

plan, which contains the depths of infinite wisdom.

I should be pleased to see, what I never have seen, professors following such example in obtaining what the poor widow, the fatherless, and the needy, owe them. But, says the advocate for the plan, a *distinction* ought to be made, *between* the *persons* in the Godhead. It was the second person in the Godhead, who paid this infinite debt, to the first; therefore, it is not altogether like a person paying his own demand. I say, in answer, if the first and second persons in the Godhead are not so essentially one as to make the debts due to one, belong equally to the other, and payment also, they are not so essentially one, as to be represented by two distinct persons, related only by Adam, who are in co. in merchandise. But, for the sake of carrying the argument still further, I will admit this *variety* of persons in an *infinite indivisible being!* And also the plan of atonement on the principle of the second person's paying the demand to the first. And here it will be necessary to introduce the *third person* in the Godhead, as it is contended that the third person makes known to the debtor, what the creditor determines concerning him.—Then the plan of the doctrine may be represented by the following similitude. A.

owes B the sum of one thousand pounds ; the time of payment comes, demand is made ; A is not worth a farthing, neither is it in his power to raise a fraction of the money. B immediately commences a process again A, of which, C. a friend of A's, being informed, goes to B, asks him how large a demand he holds against A ; B informs him, an hundred pounds and the interest. And A is worth nothing ? asks C. Nothing, answers B. Would you make a deduction of twenty five per cent, if you could have the money down ? asks C. Not the least deduction, answers B. You will, at least, throw in the interest, says C. Not the smallest fraction, answers B. Well, says C, if you have no *mercy* on the *poor* and *distressed*, I will share the *pleasure* of *relieving* the *debtor alone ;* counts out the money in full, and receives the obligation to bestow on his friend, A. B sends a servant immediately to inform A, that he has concluded to forgive him the debt. A is transported at the news, flies to tell his wife and children the tidings of mercy, & all join in praising such heavenly benevolence. C comes in at the same moment, with the obligation in his hand ; modestly gives it to A, desiring him to accept it as a token of undissembled friendship. A is *confounded*, asks C how he came by the obligation ;

C informs him, that he paid every farthing of the money for it, the creditor would not make the leaſt deduction. I leave the reader to judge, whether the creditor ſhowed any mercy to the debtor, and whether B's pretenſions of favoring A, do not wear the appearance of hypocriſy. It is contended, by thoſe who hold to this debt, and the payment of it, that the ſalvation of the ſinner is by being forgiven; yet, they contend, that the debt is paid. But how I can forgive a man a debt, and oblige him to pay it, is more than I can ſee.

Again, admitting the ſyſtem true, I wiſh to enquire into the propriety of an innocent perſon's ſuffering, for one who is guilty. It is ſcripture, reaſon, and good law, never to condemn the innocent, in order to exculpate the delinquent. Suppoſing a foreign court ſends a perſon, who is old in conſpiracies and blood, to America, to lay a deep concerted plan to murder the Preſident of the union, and a number of the firſt Officers in the federal government, for purpoſes mischievous to our political exiſtence; and he ſhould ſo far ſucceed, as to engage a number in his wicked deſign, and finally makes an attempt; his plans are diſcovered by government, and detected, but not until numbers have fallen a ſacrifice to his mis-

chievous endeavors. The leader of theſe ſeditious murderers, is taken and condemned to be executed; & the voice of every friend of juſtice and equity is againſt the criminal. But what would be the conſternation of the good people of the United States, on being informed, that the good Preſident of the union, the man whom the people delighted to honor, was executed, in the room of this ſeditious perſon, and the wicked murderer ſet at liberty? Is it poſſible to conceive that there is a ſingle perſon in the world, who would call this a juſt execution? If it is ſaid that the Preſident freely offered himſelf in the room of the criminal, it alters not the caſe, in the eye of juſtice. If an innocent man can juſtly be put to death, becauſe he conſents to it willingly, a guilty one may be acquitted becauſe he prefers it. But it is further agreed, that the authority had power to raiſe the Preſident from the dead, which done, renders the work juſt and glorious. I ſay, in anſwer, that if the authority had this power, it might as well have been executed on the real criminal, and raiſed him from the dead, as to perform this work on one who was not guilty, What is the moſt ſhocking of any thing, in this ſyſtem of atonement, is, the partiality repreſented in the

Almighty; for, admitting the plan rational, as it reſpects thoſe circumſtances, in which I have ſhewn its abſurdity, what can we find in ſcripture, or reaſon, that juſtifies ſuch infinite partiality in our Creator? or what can, in the leaſt, ſerve as evidence to prove him poſſeſſed of it? Have we not reaſon to believe our Creator poſſeſſed of as much goodneſs as he has communicated to us? Can we rationally believe, that he is wanting, in thoſe principles of goodneſs which he has placed in our underſtandings? When he ſaw the whole progeny of Adam in the ſame ſituation, by reaſon of ſin, one no more guilty than another, why ſhould he propoſe a plan of mercy for ſome few of them, and diſregard the awful circumſtances of the reſt? The ſacred oracle declares God to be no reſpecter of perſons; if this is true, he is not a partial being. Jeſus taught the character of God to his diſciples, by turning their attention to nature, obſerving the equal diſtribution of rain and ſunſhine, on the evil and on the good, on the juſt and on the unjuſt. Suppoſing Joſeph had dealt out bread plentifully to two of his brethren in Egypt, and had ſtarved the reſt to death, would it have looked like impartiality? It is urged, that none of them deſerved a crumb from Joſeph, whom they had ſold; and if he pleaſed to give to

one, and not to another, he had a right so to do. Then I say, he had a right to be partial. I am travelling through a large and extensive wood, and many miles from any inhabitants; I find ten persons who are lost; they have been out of provision for several days; and having fatigued themselves, in wandering from hill to hill, from stream to stream, striving, to the utmost of their abilities, to find inhabitants; having given up all hopes of ever seeing their homes again, and having, in their minds, bid their wives and children a long farewel, they are waiting for hunger to do its last work! The moment I discover myself to them, with large supplies of wholesome and rich provisions, every eye glistens with unexpected joy; the current of life starts afresh in their veins, and they all advance to meet me on their enfeebled hands and knees, with eagerness to receive the staff of life! I hasten to improve the opportunity of showing my sovereignty and goodness; I feed five of them to the full, the other five, I neglect. They beg for the smallest crust, which I do not want, but to no effect. Those whom I feed solicit me every mouthful they eat, to bestow some on their fellow sufferers, but I refuse. I tell them, however, not to construe my conduct into *partiality*, but to learn my *power* and *sovereignty* by it. The five

44486A

whom I fed, I affiſt out of the wood, and leave the reſt to their wants. My *conduct*, in the above affair, appears ſo much *blacker* than my *paper* is *white*, I chooſe rather to leave the reader to make his comments, than to write my own.

I inquire ſtill farther, did the Almighty know, before he made man, that he would become a ſinner? did he know that he would deſerve an endleſs puniſhment? If the anſwer is in the negative, it ſuppoſes God to be wanting in knowledge, and that he created beings at an infinite riſk, as he did not know what would be the conſequences. If the queſtions be anſwered in the poſitive, it proves, that an infinite cruelty exiſted in God; for unleſs that was the caſe, he would never have created beings, who, he knew, would be infinitely the loſers by their exiſtence.

Thoſe who believe in the ſyſtem which I am examining, believe in the exiſtence of a Devil, whoſe exiſtence I have refuted in this work. I am willing, however, for the ſake of the argument, to admit the exiſtence of their God, and Devil likewiſe. But wiſh to enquire, which of them is, in reality, the worſt being. God, when he created mankind, perfectly knew that ſome of them would ſuffer endleſs torment, for their ſins; he muſt, therefore, have intended them for that purpoſe. For, it is in-

conſiſtent to ſuppoſe, that the Almighty would create, without a purpoſe; and his purpoſe could not be contrary to his knowledge. The matter then ſtands thus, God created millions of beings for endleſs miſery, which they could not eſcape; the Devil is deſirous of having them miſerable, and does all in his power to effect it. Now, reader, judge between theſe two beings. Had this Devil been conſulted, by the Almighty, when he laid the plan of man's final deſtiny, I cannot conceive him capable of inventing one more eligible to his infernal diſpoſition, than this which I am now diſputing.

As reaſon will not conſent to the plan of God, as deſcribed in the foregoing ſcheme, I will ſhow that the ſcriptures equally oppoſe it. It is granted that Jeſus Chriſt died for mankind, as the ſcriptures declare; but not in the way, in which thouſands have believed. But ſuppoſing he died inſtead of the ſinner, in the way which I diſpute, I ſtill wiſh to prove that he died for the whole of Adam's poſterity, as much as he did for any. If Iſaiah did not believe that that would be the caſe, I cannot reconcile his words to his opinion, which I find in chap. liii. ver. 5, 6. "But he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniqui-

ties: the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him; and with his ſtripes we are healed. *All*, we, like ſheep, have gone aſtray: We have turned *every one* to his own way; and the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us *all*." St. Paul muſt have been of this opinion, when he wrote to Timothy, or his words are not expreſſive of his belief. See 1. Tim, ii. 5, 6. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus; who gave himſelf a ranſom for all to be ſatisfied in due time." 1 Epiſtle General of John ii. 1, 2. "My little children, theſe things write I unto you, that ye ſin not, and if *any* man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our ſins, & not for ours only, but alſo for the ſins of the *whole world*." Hebrews ii. 9. "But we ſee Jeſus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the ſuffering of death, now crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God, ſhould taſte death for *every* man." The above ſcriptures, with their connexions and correſponding paſſages, as fully prove that Chriſt died for *all* men, as any one thing can be proved from the Bible. Now as there is not, in all the ſcripture, a ſingle hint to the reverſe of theſe paſſages which I have in-

troduced, it appears ſtrange and unaccountable to me, that any perſon, who profeſſes to believe the teſtimony of the Bible, ſhould ever have entertained the idea, that what theſe paſſages ſay, is falſe, and that which is not ſaid, in contradiction to what is true!

Look, ye readers, and ſubmit to aſtoniſhment, at what has been believed in, as divine truth. An Almighty, infinitely wiſe and good being, creates an innumerable multitude of rational intelligents; they rebel againſt him, and raiſe an infinite diſſatisfaction in his mind towards them; this infinite diſſatisfaction gets removed toward part of the offenders, by the ſacrifice of innocence! With the reſt, God is ſtill diſpleaſed; yet, he is almighty and infinitely wiſe, and employs his power and wiſdom to make the works of his own hand as miſerable as their natures will bear, for being juſt ſuch creatures as he knew they would be, before he made them. But it is argued, that God's knowing what ſort of creatures men would be, did not influence them, in the ſmalleſt degree, to be what they are. Let this argument be granted. But did not God know what would influence men to be what they are? Anſwer, yes. Was it in his power to remove this influential cauſe? If it was, why did he not do it, if it was

like to displease him? If it was not in his power to prevent the mischief, I wish to know whether it was in the creature's power to prevent it? If it was not in the power of them to prevent the operation of things in the way in which they have, and do take place, why is God's anger so warm against his poor impotent offspring? It seems an unhappy circumstance, for both Creator and creature. The Creator is not satisfied with his creatures; his creatures find themselves introduced into an existence infinitely worse than none. I am born into this world of sorrow and trouble; the first vibration of sense is want; I endeavor to supply my wants, and to maintain my existence, which my Maker has bestowed upon me; but as soon as I come to years of understanding, I am told of an *infinite debt* which stands against me, which I owed thousands of years before I was born; and that my Maker is so angry with me, and has been, ever since the debt was due, that he has prepared a furnace of endless flames to torment me in, according to the requirements of justice! My father gives me his farm, and puts me in possession of it; I am pleased, and prize it very highly. In consequence of my possession, I paint to myself many pleasing prospects; but, to my mortification, a person comes and pre-

sents me with a mortgage of my farm, for five times its value, the mortgage running so as to hold the possessor to clear it; I will leave the reader to say, whether my father was kind, or unkind. Yet, the circumstance into which the Almighty has introduced millions of his creatures, is infinitely worse, according to the doctrine which I am examining. It is argued with much assurance, that God has a just right to do with his creatures as he pleases, because he has it in his power so to do; and that he never does any thing, because it is right; but what he does, is right, because he does it.

If the above statement is just, moral holiness consists in the power of action, and not in the disposition that designs the action. If so, my argument in favor of sin's existing only in the design of the actor, and not in the action, is groundless; and we are driven to say, that unholiness, or sin, is the *want* of power to perform an action; and holiness consists in having the power to do it. One man designs to murder another for his money, he makes the attempt, and fails; his sin consisted in not having power to execute his design; but, in the design, there is no evil. On the other hand, he makes the attempt, and succeeds; here is no evil at all, because he had power to do it. On this princi-

ple, every thing that can be done, is moral holineſs; and every thing that cannot be done, is ſin, or moral evil.

Here we are preſented with a picture the moſt to be dreaded, of any thing which the imagination of man is capable of inventing. Power moving on in front, exhibiting tyrannic majeſty in every action; and meager juſtice in the rear, obſequiouſly pronouncing all right! If theſe things are ſo, our ſenſes are nothing but mediums of deception; and all our experience has ſerved us no other purpoſe, than to make us more ignorant. Who is there in the world, poſſeſſing common ſenſe, that does not dread and revolt from power, in every inſtance, where they ſee it connected with an evil diſpoſition? Are we right, in wiſhing our enemies weak? We are, and that becauſe their ſtrength being directed by their wicked deſigns, gives us fear.

But, for the ſake of the argument ſtill further, let it be granted, that God being ſupreme, had a right to do, becauſe he had the power, And he creates millions of beings, whom he intends for endleſs torments, and puts his whole deſign into execution; and this is called ſupreme goodneſs. Now I wiſh to know, how a ſupreme evil could be deſcribed? All will grant, that evil is in oppoſition to good;

then an oppoſite deſcription would be juſt. To create, with an intention to make eternally happy, and to put that intention into execution, would be ſupreme evil! But, according to the doctrine which I am examining, God contains thoſe two characters in himſelf, having created ſome for one purpoſe, and ſome for the other. It will be of no advantage to the reader to have the abſurdity of the above propoſition any more expoſed, than enough to have it rejected. I never heard, or read any argument to prove the propriety of the diſputed propoſition. It is a begged propoſition, and ſtands without the leaſt ſhadow of evidence from ſcripture or reaſon; but it requires no great ingenuity to ſee what the chimera was intended for; without it, the whole plan and ſcheme of atonement, which I am examining, would fall, for want of foundation.

There are ſome of Paul's writings to the Romans, which have been uſed by divines, to prove the partial plan of ſalvation true, of which, I think, it will be proper to take notice, in this place. Romans ix. 21, 22. has been made great uſe of, in order to prove, that God made ſome men veſſels of eternal diſhonor, and others veſſels of eternal glory. The words read as follows: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the ſame lump, to

make one veſſel unto honor, and another unto diſhonor? What if God, willing to ſhow his wrath, and to make his power known, endureth with much long ſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted for deſtruction." In order that the reader may ſee, that the paſſage has not the meaning which has been generally attached to it, let him obſerve, that the two veſſels, mentioned in the text, are made of the *same lump;* which alſo may be ſeen in God's communication to Jeremiah, ſee Jeremiah xviii. 3, 4. "Then I went down to the potter's houſe, and behold he wrought a work on the wheels, and the veſſels that he made of clay, was marred in the hand of the potter, ſo he had made it again another veſſel, as it ſeemed good to the potter to make it." Obſerve, the firſt veſſel being marred was diſhonorable, and is marred *in* the potter's hand. The potter did not make the veſſel perfectly ſound and good, and lay it away whole, and the veſſel mar itſelf afterwards; but it marred, while *in* the *hand* of the *Potter*. The potter did not condemn the clay as good for nothing, becauſe it marred; he did not caſt it away and take other clay, to make another veſſel; but, of the ſame clay, made a veſſel as it ſeemed good unto him to make it. This veſſel not being marred, was a veſſel of honor. Here the rea-

der may see the power of God manifested, in making, of the same lump, a vessel of honor, and a vessel of dishonor.

The thread of the apostle's discourse to the Romans, in which he introduced the passage above written, was intended to show the distinction between law and gospel, or flesh and spirit; by turning to the eighth chapter, the reader will find himself assisted in the introduction of this particular. We then say, that as man stands in the earthly Adam, he is a marred vessel. Christ himself, when for us he was made a sin offering, in the fleshly nature, was "more marred than any man, and his form than the sons of men." But in his resurrection, he was a vessel of honor and immortal glory; "and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Further, see the two vessels described in 1 Cor. xv. 42. "*It* is sown in *corruption*, *it* is raised in *incorruption*; *it* is sown in *dishonor*, *it* is raised in *glory*; *it* is sown in *weakness* *it* is raised in *power*; *it* is sown a *natural* body, *it* is raised a *spiritual* body." Again, Romans xi 7, &c. "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded; according as it is written, God

hath given them the ſpirit of ſlumber, eyes that they ſhould not ſee, & ears that they ſhould hear unto this day. And David ſaith, let their table be made a ſnare, and a trap, and a ſtumbling block, and a recompenſe unto them; let their eyes be darkened, that they may not ſee, and bow down their back alway."

On this paſſage, and others like it, is built the doctrine of limited ſalvation, by Jeſus Chriſt, according to the fore knowledge and predeſtination of the Almighty. It is argued, that thoſe who are here called the elect, are thoſe for whom Chriſt died, and thoſe alone who will finally obtain ſalvation by him. But why any perſon ſhould make ſuch a miſtake, in reading this chapter, I am at a loſs. The ſalvation of the elect is not argued, in this chapter; but the certainty of the ſalvation of thoſe who are blinded, and the propriety of believing it, occupies the greateſt part of it. Obſerve the words next to thoſe I have quoted above, verſe 11, &c. "I ſay then have they ſtumbled, that they ſhould fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall ſalvation is come unto the Gentiles, to provoke them unto jealouſy. Now, if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminiſhing of them, the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fullneſs?" Again, verſe

15th, " For if the caſting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what ſhall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead ?" Again in his argument to the Romans, he endeavors to ſhow them, by the ſimilitude of the branches of olive trees, that they ought to believe that thoſe blinded ones, though broken off through unbelief, would be grafted in again. See verſe 24, " For. if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature, into a good olive tree ; how much more ſhall theſe, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree ?" The apoſtle ſeems deſirous to inſtruct the Roman church, and argues the point fervently ; ſee verſes 25, 26. " For I would not, brethren, that ye ſhould be ignorant of this myſtery, *(leſt ye should be wise in your own conceits,)* that blindneſs in part is happened to Iſrael, until the *fullness* of the *Gentiles* be come in. And ſo all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved ; as it is written, there ſhall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and ſhall *turn away ungodliness* from Jacob." Compare the laſt verſe which I have quoted, with Levit. xxvi 44, 45. " And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not caſt them away, neither will I abhor them, to deſtroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with

them : for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their fakes remember the covenant of their anceſtors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, in the ſight of the heathen, that I might be their God : I am the Lord." And Iſaiah xlv. 25. "In the Lord ſhall *all* the ſeed of Iſrael be *juſtified*, and ſhall *glory*." Many like paſſages might be quoted, from various parts of the ſcripture ; but, perhaps, the above will ſuffice for this particular purpoſe. More of the like nature, will be noticed in the ſequel of this work.

The ſcriptures have been as much violated, to maintain the doctrine which I am examining, as good reaſon is, by ſuppoſing God to be infinitely partial, as he muſt be, in the eye of reaſon, in order to be what the doctrine repreſents him.

I ſhall now invite the attention of the reader to another ſyſtem of atonement, which was undoubtedly formed, with a view to ſhun the abſurdities in the former, and to get rid of ſome of the conſequences that were naturally deducible from the idea of the ſufferings of Chriſt. This ſyſtem ſuppoſes, that the atonement by Chriſt was not intended for the ſalvation of any part of the human race ; that its main end, and ſole object, was the glory of the Supreme Being as manifeſted in his holy and righteous law. In ſupport of this plan,

it is argued, that it is inconſiſtent, for infinite wiſdom and goodneſs to prefer an inferior object to a ſuperior one; that all creation, when compared with the Creator, ſinks into nothing, bearing no poſſible proportion to the infinite Jehovah; of courſe, that God always has his own glory in view, as his ſupreme object, in all he does.

This plan agrees with the former, in ſuppoſing ſin to be of infinite magnitude, and deſerving of endleſs puniſhment; that, as the law of God is infinite, like himſelf, finite man is infinitely to blame, for not fulfilling all its requirements; and that the penalty of the law is endleſs miſery, which penalty Chriſt ſuſtained; not with a view of acquitting the ſinner, not in room and ſtead of the tranſgreſſor, as is ſuppoſed in the other plan; but for the honor of divine juſtice, and the glory of his Father. It is further argued, that by Chriſt's ſuffering the penalty of the law, juſtice is as fully ſatisfied, as if all mankind had been made miſerable for an eternity. And this being the caſe, it is now juſt and right for God to acquit as many of the ſinful race of Adam, as is conſiſtent with his grand object, which is himſelf; yet by no means rendering it unjuſt for God to puniſh, to all eternity, as

many as is neceſſary, in order for the ſatisfying the ſame grand object.

I firſt enquire into the propriety of the argument, on which this plan of atonement ſeems to be founded; which is, that God always acts for his own infinite and incomprehenſible glory; never ſtooping ſo low, as to act with an intention for the good of his creatures.

1ſt. I aſk is God as infinitely glorious as he can be, or not? If it be anſwered, that he is; then, if his object, in all he does, is to augment *his own* glory, he never has nor will he ever accompliſh his intention. If it is argued, that it is not to augment his own glory, but to ſecure it, and maintain it in its proper ſplendor, it argues it to be of a periſhable nature, and that it would decay, were it not for the continual vigilance of the Almighty in preſerving it. If it is argued, that neither of theſe objects is right, but that it is the manifeſtation of his glory to intelligent beings, which is the grand deſign or object of God; in all his acts, without any reference to the effect which this manifeſtation has on thoſe to whom it is made, I ſay, the object has now dwindled into annihilation; there is not the ſmalleſt imaginable atom of it left. To ſuppoſe, that any rational being can wiſh, or deſire, to accompliſh any piece of labor, without

having any reference to the consequences, is too glaringly absurd, to need refutation. Now the nature of the proposition which I am examining confines the motive of Deity within himself, and himself from his creation. In order, therefore to look at the Almighty, as he is by this doctrine represented, we must look at him as destitute of a creation, and view him abstractly from all his creatures. But may I ask, what title to give that being of whom we speak? The name *Jehovah*, truly has reference to his self existence, and to his character as the giver of existence also. The name *God* implies a being who is worshipped. *Lord*, signifies a possessor. *I am that I am* has reference to an unchangeable being, but does not determine a being of goodness. I ask, again, what do we know of an Almighty, only by his works? If his existence can ever be determined, by any other means, I am ignorant of the way. What do we know, but by our senses? Have we any sense of good, or evil, that does not concern created beings? We may say, if we please, that God acts for his own essential good, abstractly from his creation; but what do we mean by it? An action, for the good of any being, presupposes that being in want; and if in want, then not infinitely happy. If God is not infinitely happy, he never can

be. I inquire, further. by what data, can we determine that God is a good being! Can we determine it by any other criterion, than by the effects of what he does, as it concerns his creatures? The truth undoubtedly is, that just as far as we can look into creation, providence and redemption, and see the harmony & beauty of them, & see that all were calculated for the good of created intelligences, whom these things concern, we are satisfied, that he, who conducts the whole, is a good being. And if we say he is *good* without this understanding. we acknowledge a proposition, for which, we are unable to adduce the smallest reason. Again, is it not wrong to make a separation, where the Almighty does not? Is he not perfectly joined to his creation? Do we not live, move, and have our being in God? Were we not created *of his fullness?* Had Deity any thing, of which to create beings, but his own eternal nature? I know it has been said, that God created *all things* out of *nothing*, &c.; but such an idea will never be imbibed by me, until I can form, in imagination, at least, a notion, of how much *nothing* it takes to make the least imaginable *something*. If all things were created of the infinite Jehovah, as great a part of his creation as we take from him, so great a proportion we take from his

fullneſs. God never could be more than than infinite, in his fullneſs; then, to take the ſmalleſt creature from him, which he created *of* that infinite fullneſs, you have left ſomething leſs than infinity. Now, if it be argued, that God acts for the good of himſelf, conſidering his creatures to belong to his fullneſs, I am perfectly agreed: But, to ſay, that the Almighty has, or ever could have, a motive, in action, that did not embrace every conſequence that could ariſe from what he did, would be limiting his omniſciency; or, to ſay, that he did not intend good, to all whom his acts concern, would be limiting his goodneſs, and an impeachment on his juſtice.

I have before, in this work, contended, that all the attributes, which we aſcribe to God, we call *good*, on account of the advantages which we derive from ſuch principles. We are told of a God who acts for his own benefit, abſtractly from his creation; and that, in millions of cases, he finds it moſt for his glory to make his rational, hoping, wanting creatures endleſſly miſerable; and this is called *goodneſs*. We are likewiſe told of a devil, who acts for his own gratification, and who delights in making God's creatures miſerable; and this is called *badneſs*. But, for my part, according to ſuch ſtatements, the differ-

ence, between goodneſs and badneſs, is ſo ſmall, I can hardly diſtinguiſh it. It is profane, in my opinion to attribute a diſpoſition to the Almighty, which we can juſtly condemn in our elves. A man, who ſhould act from ſuch a ſelfiſh principle as is attributed to God, would render himſelf wholly unworthy of the protection of common law. And ſhall we thus repreſent our kind and merciful Father, from whom ten thouſand ſtreams of goodneſs continually flow to his wanting and needy creatures? No; let every vibration of ſenſe within us acknowledge his bountiful hand, which is never cloſed.

I have already labored, in this work, to ſhow that *sin* is *finite*, and not committed againſt an *infinite law*. I ſhall, however, now call into examination a ſubject ſomething like it, which is that of penalty; as it is contended, the penalty of God's law, is endleſs puniſhment, &c.

I firſt enquire, why does a legiſlature affix penalties to laws which it makes? Anſwer, the firſt reaſon is, the ſtrength and ſecurity of government. 2d. That the puniſhment may ſerve to reclaim the delinquent. 3d. That the puniſhment of a criminal may ſerve to deter others from the commiſſion of like crimes. 4th. In many caſes, to keep the delinquent, by

confinement or death, from doing any more mischief.

Now let us look into the government of an Almighty Being, and see how the matter of *penalty* will operate there. Observe, the penalty is *endless misery*. I ask, is this necessary, to secure the govern- of an Almighty Being? would his government be in danger, if this penalty were not enacted to his law? Supposing a legislature of men had the power in their hands, of causing all the community, on whom its laws were binding to love their laws, in every requirement, and with vigilance to attend to the faithful discharge of their duty in all things, would it be necessary for them to enact penalties to their laws? Allowing the legislature to have such power, who, in the world, would say, it is not best to exercise it; that it is better to have penal laws, and let the people have their wicked obdurate hearts, so that now and then we may have a poor criminal to execute? I can hardly believe, that any will contend, that *penalty* is *necessary*, in the *law* of *God*, in order to secure his government. Is there any scruple, respecting God's power to turn the hearts of his creatures as he pleases? If there is not, then there is no need of a penalty in his law, in order for the security of his government.

2dly. Is this penalty neceſſary, in order to reclaim the delinquent? Anſwer, that is impoſſible. The *penalty* being *endleſs punishment*, it can have *no object in reclaiming the punished*. The execution of ſuch a penalty, on any of God's creatures, would prove the contractedneſs of his goodneſs, as no *poſſible good* could be communicated to a *victim* of ſuch *punishment*. Divine truth ſays, *God* is *good* unto *all*, and his *tender mercies* are *over all the works of his hands*. To ſay, God is good to a creature of his, whom he irrevocably dooms to endleſs torments, is a violation of our ſenſes; and no perſon in a moment of ſobriety, will believe it. It is then evident, that ſuch a penalty would not be neceſſary to reclaim the ſinner.

3dly. Is it neceſſary to inflict ſuch a penalty on the tranſgreſſor, in order to deter others from the commiſſion of ſin? Anſwer, no; for, according to the doctrine which I am examining, the firſt tranſgreſſion committed, involved the whole human race in delinquency; and an execution of ſuch a penalty, would be the endleſs miſery of the whole family of man; there would not have been one left to be deterred from ſinning, or even to tell the news!

4thly. Is ſuch a penalty neceſſary, in order to keep the ſinner from ſinning any

more? So far from that, this penalty would fix the delinquents in a situation, in which they could do nothing but sin, to an endless eternity. No moral being can be miserable, as *suffering conscious guilt*, without sin; therefore, in order for endless misery to be inflicted, *endless transgression is necessary*.

Look, kind reader, and see what an absurdity lies here. Because a being has sinned once, the law which he violated requires that he should continue in transgression! Well, he complies; will the law justify him? But, says the reader, I do not understand you. Why? the matter is plain; if a moral being cannot be miserable, without sin, he must continue in sin, in order to be miserable. Then, if God's law requires endless misery, it requires endless transgression! But, it is argued, that a *law* cannot *exist*, without a penalty, This undoubtedly, is an error. The *largest signification* of the *word*, *law*, is *governing power*. See Rom. vii. 23. "But I see another *law* in my members, warring against the *law* of my mind, and bringing me into captivity unto the *law* of *sin*, which is in my members." This law of sin in the members, which brings the man into captivity, is undoubtedly the power of the flesh, which lusteth

againſt the ſpirit, that we cannot do the things we would. Now, I aſk, is there any penalty to this law? Does this *law* adminiſter any condemnation to thoſe who do not obey it? Moſt ſurely it does not. Then paſs to the eighth chapter and ſecond verſe, "For the *law* of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus hath made me free from the law of ſin and death. This *law* is undoubtedly the *governing* power of the heavenly nature, which overcomes the carnal mind, and delivers the ſoul from the bondage of ſin. I aſk, again, is there any penalty to this law? Is there a diſpenſation of condemnation adminiſtered by this law of life? Truth ſays, the wages of ſin is death. Does this death flow from the *law* of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus? Surely not. "To be carnal minded is death." If carnal mindedneſs is that death, which is the wages of ſin, ſurely it does not flow from the ſpirit of life; "To be ſpiritually minded is life and peace."

God's moral law is like himſelf, *love;* "God is *love*, and he who loveth, dwelleth in God, and God in him." It requires all moral beings to love God and each other; and the reaſon why it commands this, is, it is love itſelf. True, that ſoul is miſerable that does not love God, and the reaſons are, *love* is the life and happi-

nefs of the foul, and *hatred* is its death and mifery.

Although I think I have given unanfwerable reafons, why I do not admit fuch a penalty as I have examined, I will, for the fake of the argument ftill further, allow it, and inquire into Chrift's fuffering it.

To fay, that Chrift *has fuffered* fuch a penalty is a contradiction in terms, becaufe an endlefs duration has not, yet, expired. To fay that this penalty ever will be *fuffered*, by Chrift, or any otner being, is another contradiction in words; for an endlefs duration will never expire. Then to fay that fuch a penalty has been, or ever will be fuffered, is erroneous.

If it be argued, that Chrift was an *infinite* perfon, and, therefore, could fuffer an endlefs punifhment, in a few moments; I anfwer, it is not fhunning the contradiction. If the pofition be moved, and the argument is, that he being *infinite*, could fuffer as much, in a few moments, as *all* mankind would, to an endlefs duration; I afk, are there more *infinite* beings than one? All anfwer, no. I afk, again, is it poffible for that infinite being to fuffer? Even from my opponent, the anfwer will be, that the infinite himfelf did not fuffer; but that it was the finite nature which fuffered, and was rifen from the dead, by the

infinite ; that it was the *human nature* which was made a ſin offering ; and that the divine nature gave victory to the human, by raiſing it into an immortal life. Well then, the ſufferings of Chriſt were *finite*, and could by no means anſwer the requirements of an *infinite* penalty.

The particular difference, between this plan and the former, is in the intentions of the *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*. The former ſuppoſes, that Chriſt ſuffered, in room and ſtead of the ſinner, ſo as to acquit all thoſe from condemnation, for whom he died : This argues, that the intention of the ſufferings of Chriſt was not the ſalvation of ſinners ; but, as I have before obſerved, the glory of the Supreme Being. But, that by the ſufferings of Chriſt, the law is perfectly magnified, and made honorable ; and that it is juſt, for God to acquit as many of the ſinful race of Adam, as is conſiſtent with his glory ; but does not render it unjuſt, for him to puniſh, endleſsly, as many as is neceſſary for the ſame grand object.

Now, admitting the penalty of the law to be endleſs, and that Chriſt ſuffered it in full, the *law* cannot now require the deſtruction of the offender ; how then can we reaſonably argue, that it is for the glory of God, to puniſh, when juſtice does not require it ? If juſtice does require it

now, of *any*, it does of *all*. If it be argued, that divine juſtice does not require the endleſs happineſs or miſery of man, I ſay, it is not a law which concerns mankind; and if we ſay, God's will, in the miſery of mankind, extends farther than the requirements of his juſtice, it is ſetting the Almighty againſt himſelf. Again, admitting ſuch proviſions to be made, as render it inconſiſtent with his juſtice, that all ſinners ſhould be emancipated from death and miſery, does eternal love and mercy require leſs?

Suppoſing five hundred Americans are in ſlavery at Algiers: Our Conſul demands the price of their redemption, per man; he is anſwered, the price of one, is the price of the whole; and the price of the whole, is the price of one; the ſum is five hundred dollars. This, the Dey ſays, is not a conſideration for the ſlaves, but to ſhow America, or the United States, his power, and the dignity of his government. Our Conſul obtains the money, and pays it. Now, reader, do you think he would confine the benefits of this ranſom-money, to a ſmall part of thoſe unfortunate Americans; and out of *five hundred*, ſend but *fifty* home to their *wives*, *children*, *country*, and *friends*; and tell the remaining four hundred and fifty, that

the money was his own, and he had a right to extend, or not extend the benefits of it, as he pleased; and that it was his pleasure that they should all wear out a miserable life of slavery, where they might dream of liberty, but never enjoy it? The smallest degree of humanity would argue better things.

We have now examined the foundation of this plan of atonement, and it has removed out of our sight; we have sought carefully after the penalty of the law, and cannot find it; we have sought for the satisfaction of such penal requirements, admitting they did exist, and find it not; we have admitted, for the sake of the query, that such satisfaction did take place, and we have sought for the consequences which are argued, and find them inconsistent with such premises.

Taking my leave of this plan of atonement, I shall introduce a third one, from which I shall also dissent, and give my reasons for so doing. The plan agrees with the former in respect to the law, its penalty and the personage of him who makes the atonement; but differs, in respect to the *intentions* of *God*, *in* the atonement. As far as the first transgression concerned mankind, it is believed that the atonement by Christ is fully efficacious; and that no man will, or can be miserable for-

ever, on account of what is called *original sin*. And that, by virtue of the ſufferings of Chriſt, Adam and *all* his poſterity were immediately placed in a ſtate of trial, or probation, after the *fall*, ſuch as Adam was in, before, but with this difference, viz. man now knows good and evil, and is poſſeſſed of ſtrong appetites to ſin; but has, alſo, a portion of the divine Spirit, which is given to every man, for his profit, to aſſiſt him in oppoſing thoſe appetites, and ſubduing them.

Thoſe who believe in this plan, believe that it was in the power of Adam, as a moral agent, to have ſtood in a ſtate of holineſs and innocency; and that it is now in the power of every man, as a moral agent, to obtain the paradiſe which Adam loſt. They do not admit that Chriſt died for our *actual* tranſgreſſions, after we come to years of diſcretion; but of *these*, we muſt *repent*, and beg for *mercy*, and God will forgive, on our humble and ſincere application. The ſum of this plan of atonement, made ſalvation *possible* unto *all men*, but *certain* unto *none*. It argues, that it is the *will* of *God*, that *all* men ſhould be ſaved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth; that *all* ſhould repent of their ſins, and receive the Redeemer on the reaſonable terms upon which he is offered to us.

Thoſe who believe in this plan, believe it poſſible for men to neglect thoſe privileges, ſlight thoſe merciful offers, and turn a deaf ear to all the warnings of the Spirit, until the day of their probation is ended, whereby all that the Saviour has done, is made of no effect unto them. And that thouſands will be thus neglectful, and be miſerable as long as God exiſts; not, however for the ſin which Adam committed, but for their own perſonal tranſgreſſions.

Before I put the foregoing ſyſtem of atonement under examination, I will take notice of the character of the Mediator, as believed in, by all thoſe who hold to the ſeveral ſyſtems of which I have taken notice, as I have not examined that particular, in my enquiries on the other ſyſtems preceding the one under conſideration. They all contend, that the Mediator is *really God;* that the Godhead conſiſts of *three distinct persons*, viz. *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost;* that theſe diſtinct perſons are equal in power and glory, and *eternally* and *essentially one!*

The reader will obſerve my uſual mode of reaſoning, which is to admit, as truth, what I wiſh to oppoſe; and to oppoſe it, with the conſequence which neceſſarily follows. For the ſake of the argument, then, I admit the foregoing ſtatement of

the character of Chriſt to be juſt ; and then I contend, that if he is the *Son* of *God*, he is the *son* of *himself*, and is his own father ; that he is no more the *Son* of *God*, than *God* is his *son!* To ſay, of two perſons, exactly of the ſame age, that one of them is a real ſon of the other, is to confound good ſenſe. If Jeſus Chriſt was really *God*, it muſt be argued, that *God really died!* Again if the Godhead conſiſts of *three distinct* perſons, and each of thoſe *persons* is *infinite*, the *whole Godhead* amounts to the amazing ſum of infinity, mutiplied by three! If it is ſaid, that neither of theſe three perſons alone is infinite, I ſay, the *three together*, with the addition of a *million* more *such*, would not make an *infinite being*. But ſuppoſing we get over all thoſe abſurdities, with as much eaſe as a miſcalculation ſhews the truth ; and ſuppoſe that theſe three diſtinct perſons formed the grand council in heaven, on the ſalvation of man, after the firſt tranſgreſſion.

In this council, and on ſo momentous an occaſion, the firſt perſon addreſſes the other two, ſaying, the colony which we have planted on our new made earth have rebelled, & you know the penalty, which is endleſs miſery, muſt be immediately executed on the two delinquents, unleſs a diſpenſation can be deviſed more favorable

to the offenders, and equally satisfactory to justice. As the attribute of justice, spake in the first person, that of mercy, speaks in the second, and proposes a pardon. Justice opposes, and contends that his honor depends on the penalty's being put in execution. Mercy again replies, the second person in the Godhead shall suffer the penalty due to sin, and justice shall grant man a second probation, in which he may secure the life, which he, by rebellion, lost. That reasonable conditions should be proposed, and the third person should make them known to man, and give him proper directions how to fulfil them; and if man faithfully attends to these conditions, he secures his happiness; if not, mercy makes no more requests in favor of the offender. To this, all agree; and it is registered accordingly.

It seems, acccording to this plan, that man utterly failed, on the *first* trial, but now has the opportunity. I would ask, is there any more certainty of his succeeding now, than there was before? Is it certain, according to this plan, that any of Adam's posterity will obtain salvation? Is it not in the power of all men to neglect those conditions? If it be not, it destroys the nature of conditions, and of probation; if it is, then it was entirely un-

certain, whether an individual soul will ever be saved by the gospel plan.

I have before shewn it erroneous to suppose, that any finite being could suffer an infinite punishment, in any period of time; & I think it is also granted, that an *infinite* being cannot *suffer*. But, admitting the system of atonement to stand on the ground contended for, it was a matter of utter uncertainty, whether it would, in *any instance*, prove *efficacious*, as it respected the *salvation of men*.

A rich parent gives a large portion to his son, accompanied with good advice; the son turns prodigal, spends *all* and gets into prison for debt. The father still loves the son, pays his debts, lets him out of prison, sets him at *liberty*, and gives him a thousand pounds more, which is all he ever can give him, and tells him to be more prudent. The prodigal, no sooner than he finds himself thus liberated, and in possession of a handsome property, goes into the same error, which brought him to ruin before, and finally meets the same consequences. The father has no more to give, and the son becomes a vagabond. I ask, did the parent act the part of wisdom, any more than the son did? If he had acted wisely, would he not have said to him, Son, I gave you much at the first; I gave you good advice; I told you, that

induſtry and prudence alone would ſecure you from want ; I told you, though your property were large, unleſs you put your money to intereſt, or into trade, it muſt dwindle ; that if you threw away your time, in vain and fooliſh prodigality, the end would be what you have already experienced ? And although I hoped better things of you, than a total neglect of my admonitions, yet, I feared ; and, for your good, have reſerved one thouſand pounds of what I intended to give you, which, had you been economical, I ſhould, by this time, have committed to your care. But, as you have conducted ſo fooliſhly, I muſt, for your benefit, keep the remainder of your portion, until you prove yourſelf a convert, from prodigality to economy.

If the Almighty were ignorant, at firſt, when he put man in poſſeſſion of privileges which he afterwards abuſed, it aſtoniſhes me that he ſhould riſk the laſt favor which he had to beſtow, on principles which he had juſt ſeen fail. It will undoubtedly be acknowledged, by all, that Jehovah knew, as perfectly before tranſgreſſion as afterwards, what man would do, and how he would diſpoſe of the advantages which he had beſtowed on him. Then I aſk, if God knew how man would abuſe thoſe privileges, and knew he would

be eternally miſerable, in conſequence, was it an act of kindneſs, in God, to grant man ſuch privileges ? I aſk, again, was it poſſible for that to fail, which the Almighty perfectly knew would take place ? The anſwer will be, no. Then, when we have conſolidated the whole down to its real ſelf, all the privilege which God gave to thoſe whom he knew would render themſelves objects of his diſpleaſure, was a *privilege* of incurring to themſelves endleſs miſery ; I ſay more, he inſured it to them himſelf, by putting that into their hands, by which he knew it would be effected.

I give my child a *loaded piſtol*, which I tell him to diſcharge at a ſerpent, on his way where I have ordered him. I know perfectly well, when I give him the piſtol, that he will carelessly *blow his own brains out with the contents*, and *the serpent will go unhurt ;* the child's end happens, accordingly. I leave the reader to judge, whether I am the murderer of my child ; my *conscience* would inform me.

The Mediator ſuffered the penalty of the law, to reinſtate man in ſtate of *probation ; God* made a revelation to mankind, for their inſtruction ; he inſpired the ancient prophets, to ſpeak of the things of of his kingdom ; ſent his holy Spirit into

the world, to lead and guide man into all truth; and all this is done, from the pure benevolence of God towards a sinful world, for its everlasting welfare, but *all* upon *uncertainties!* After all, man has it in his *power* to frustrate the whole plan of grace, and render it abortive! O! ye angels of celestial purity, had ye known this, ye would not have sung, on the auspicious birth day of Emanuel, "*Great joy which shall be unto all people.*"

On the other hand, it was possible for every son and daughter of Adam to accept of Christ, on the very easy terms of gospel obedience, and thereby to have secured the heavenly kingdom. This being granted, who knows they will not do it? Things that are *possible*, *may be done*; and who can say, for certainty, that those things which are possible, will not be effected? If it be an absolute certainty, that any will finally fail of gaining the prize, it is also an *absolute certainty* that they have *no possible opportunity for it*: If there is an opportunity, and the prize is attainable by *all*, there is, at least, some room for hope; and were it the *real christian hope*, it would be like an *anchor* to the *soul*, both *sure* and *steadfast*; but being founded *in the creature* and not *in God*, it is *wavering* and *doubtful*.

On this ſyſtem, it muſt be abſurd to argue the *certainty* of the *endless misery* of *any* of the *family of man*, as the *ſalvation of the whole is possible*. *God*, out of love to his creatures, made it *possible* for them *all* to obtain ſalvation; indeed, it is his will, that all ſhould be ſaved from their ſins; it is, alſo, the will of Chriſt, and of the Holy Spirit; it is the will of all holy beings in heaven, and of the ſaints on earth; prayers are daily offered up, from the altar of ſacrifice, for its accompliſhment: And if it be not done, the whole *Godhead* will be diſappointed; mourning, in room of rejoicing, will be the employment of holy angels, and the ſaints will be ſtung with the keeneſt ſenſations of grief.

No one will dare to ſay, he believes *God* can be *diſappointed*, in any of his purpoſes; therefore, thoſe who believe in the ſyſtem laſt examined, muſt be diſſatisfied with it, if their eyes ſhould ever be opened to ſee its conſequences.

Having examined thoſe ſeveral ſyſtems of atonement, in as conciſe a method as was convenient, and having given my principal reaſons for not adopting either, I now beg the attention of the reader to my ſecond inquiry, viz.

The necessity of Atonement, and where satisfaction must be made.

I have, already, entered my proteſt, againſt the necessity of atonement, on the principles upon which christians have generally believed it, by ſhowing the finite nature of ſin, and the error of ſuppoſing that the law of God required the endleſs misery of mankind, as a penal requiſition.

Atonement ſignifies *reconciliation*, or *satisfaction*, which is the ſame. It is a being *unreconciled to truth and justice*, which needs *reconciliation*; and it is a *dissatisfied being* which needs *satisfaction*. Therefore, I raiſe my enquiry on the queſtion, Is *God* the *unreconciled* or *dissatisfied party* or is it *man*?

For our aſſiſtance on this queſtion, let us turn our attention to God's dealings with Adam on the day of tranſgreſſion, and the conduct of Adam, the tranſgreſſor. After Adam had eaten of the forbidden fruit, his eyes opened to the knowledge of good and evil, and he found himſelf naked, and endeavored to hide himſelf from God, which he certainly would not have done, had he conſidered his Maker his friend. Sin produced two errors in the mind of Adam, which have been very incident to mankind ever ſince; the firſt was, he be-

lieved *God* to be his enemy, in conſequence of diſobedience; and, ſecondly, that he could reconcile his Maker, by works of his own. The firſt of theſe errors we diſcover, from Adam's endeavoring to *hide* from *God;* and the ſecond is ſeen, in his endeavoring to clothe himſelf with the works of his own hands. It is plain, that a material *change* had taken place in *Adam;* but can we prove, that any alteration happened in God? It is very evident, that Adam was unreconciled to God; but it is equally evident, that God was not unreconciled to him. God's calling to Adam, in the *cool* of the day, and aſking him where he was; clothing him with a garment of ſkins, and promiſing that the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe the ſerpent's head, are beautiful repreſentations of the parental love and fatherly care of the Creator. It ought to be obſerved, that God pronounced no curſe on Adam, but on the ſerpent. If the Almighty had been *unreconciled* or *diſſatisfied* with his creature man, in room of promiſing him a final *victory* over the *ſerpent*, the *curſe* would undoubtedly have *fallen* on the *object* of his *diſpleaſure*.

To ſay, that God loved man any leſs, after tranſgreſſion, than before, denies his *unchangeability;* but, to ſay, that man

was wanting in love to God, places him in his real character. As God was not the unreconciled party, no atonement was neceſſary for his reconciliation. Where there is a diſſatisfaction, it pre-ſuppoſes an *injured* party; and can it be hard to determine which was *injured* by *sin*, the *Creator*, or the *sinner?* If God was unreconciled to man, the atonement was neceſſary, to *renew* his *love* to his *creature;* but if *man* was the *unreconciled*, the *atonement* was neceſſary, to *renew* his *love* to his *Creator*. The matter is now ſtated ſo plainly, that no perſon, who can read, can miſtake.

I ſhall now endeavor to prove, from ſcripture, that the atonement by Chriſt was the *effect*, and not the *cause*, of God's love to man. See St. John iii. 16, "For God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth on him might not periſh, but have everlaſting life." According to this paſſage, nothing is more plain, in ſcripture, than the idea, that what Chriſt did for ſinners, was a conſequence of God's love to them. Again, verſe 17, "For God ſent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be ſaved." This paſſage ſays, that *God* did not ſend his Son into the world to condemn the world; but, according to

the general idea of atonement, *Christ* ſtood as the *proxy* of *man*, and the world was tried in him, and condemned in him, and in him ſuffered the penalty of the law which man had tranſgreſſed. It is alſo ſaid, in the text, that Chriſt was ſent, that the world through him might be ſaved; which, if true, goes to prove, that the Father's object, in Chriſt's coming into the world, was the ſalvation of the ſinner, and not for the removing of any diſſatisfaction in himſelf towards them. Again, ſee Romans v. 8, "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were *yet ſinners*, Chriſt died for us." As the *death* of *Christ* is here ſpoken of as a *commendation* of God's love to us, it ought to be conſidered as an *effect* and not the *cauſe* of that love. Again, 1 Epiſtle of John iv. 9, "In this, was manifeſted the love of *God* towards us, becauſe that God ſent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." If Chriſt's coming into the world, was a manifeſtation of God's love to us, this love muſt have exiſted before he came, and his coming was an *effect* produced by it. Verſe 10, "Herein is *love*, not that *we loved God*, but that *he loved us*, and ſent his Son to be the propitiation for our ſins." Verſe 19, "We love him, becauſe he *firſt* loved us."

From thoſe paſſages, & many more which might be quoted, to the ſame effect, it is eaſy to learn, that, what the Mediator did for ſinners, was the *conſequence*, and not the *cauſe* of God's love to us. God being infinite in all his glorious attributes, he can by no means love, at one time, and hate the ſame object, at another. His divine omniſciency comprehended all the events of time and eternity; therefore, nothing could take place, to remove his love from an object on which it was placed. The Almighty had no occaſion to diſlike Adam, after tranſgreſſion, any more than he had even before he made him; for, he knew as well then, that he would ſin, as he did after it was actually done. The reaſon that we mortals love an object, at one time, & diſlike it, at another, is the weakneſs of our underſtandings; we have not always the ſame view of the ſame object. We may ſlight an object of great value, its excellencies being out of our ſight; and we may ſet our affections on one of no value, by erroneouſly attaching a value to it which it does not poſſeſs. But the Infinitely Wiſe is ſubject to no miſtakes; he comprehends the whole futurition of all moral beings, and loves them as his own offſpring, with a love conſiſtent wit his immutable exiſtence. Therefore, it is evident, that God was not the unreconciled,

and, of courſe, did not require an atonement to reconcile himſelf to his creatures.

Let us now turn on the other ſide, and ſee if man is not unreconciled to God; and if it would not be more reaſonable, to reconcile man to his Maker, than to reconcile God to to the ſinner, See Pſalm xiv. 2, 3. "The lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to ſee if there were any that did underſtand and ſeek God. They are all gone aſide; they are altogether became filthy: there is *none* that *doeth good, no not one.*"

The apoſtle Paul, in the third chapter of Romans, giving a general deſcription of mankind, introduces it with the paſſage from Pſalms, which I have juſt quoted, and continues it by an aſſembly of various paſſages, ſee verſe 13, &c. "Their throat is an open ſepulchre; with their tongues, they have uſed deceit; the poiſon of aſps is under their lips; whoſe mouth is full of curſing and bitterneſs; their feet are ſwift to ſhed blood; deſtruction and miſery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." It is very evident, that the apoſtle meant to exclude none from this deſcription, as the reader may learn from verſe 19, "Now we know, that what thing ſoever the law ſaith, it ſaith to them that are under the

law; that every mouth may be ſtopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Again, chap. v. verſe 12. "Wherefore, as by one man, ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin, and ſo death paſſed upon all men, for that all have ſinned." That the ſcriptures abundantly prove, that *all* men are ſinners, and in an *unreconciled* ſtate, conſidered under the law, or in the earthly nature, will not be diſputed by any. That it is certainly *man* that needs *reconciliation*. Men while dictated by a carnal mind, are *diſſatisfied* with *God*; they accuſe him of being an hard maſter, reaping where he has not ſown, and gathering where he has not ſtrawed. They think on the Almighty, but deſire not the knowledge of his ways. They behold no beauty in him; he appears as a *tyrant*, regardleſs of the happineſs of his creatures. A conſciouſneſs of ſin, without the knowledge of God, repreſents *Deity* as *angry*, and full of *vengeance*; in which ſenſe, many ſcriptures are written, as I have before obſerved. How often do we find, that *God* has been provoked to wrath and jealouſy, and his fury raiſed to a flame againſt the ſinner? and how often do the ſcriptures repreſent him repenting of his anger, and growing calm! All theſe ſcriptures are written according to the circumſtance of the creature, and the apprehenſions

which the unreconciled entertain of God. Viewing man in this ſtate of unreconciliation to God, and holineſs, it appears evidently neceſſary, that he ſhould *receive* an *atonement* productive of a *renewal* of love to his Maker. Without atonement, God could never be ſeen as he is, "altogether lovely and the chiefeſt among ten thouſand;" nor could he be loved with the whole heart, mind, might and ſtrength. How often are men grumbling at Providence, that things ſhould be governed as they are? How often are men diſpleaſed at the Supreme himſelf? What an *infinite* number of hard ſpeeches have ſinners ſpoken againſt God? All which argue the neceſſity of atonement, whereby thoſe maladies may be healed.

What an infinite difference there is between the All-gracious and Merciful and his loſt and bewildered creatures? He, all glorious, without a ſpot in the whole infinitude of his nature; all lovely, without exception, and loving, without partiality. Who can tell the thouſandth part of his love to his offspring? And this invariably the ſame through every diſpenſation, without the ſmalleſt abatement. But what can we ſay of man? Loſt in the wilderneſs of ſin, wandering in the by paths of iniquity, loſt to the knowledge of his heavenly Benefactor, and diſſatisfied with

his God; he goes on, grumbling and complaining, attributing the worſt of characters to the moſt merciful, and entertaining no regard for the fountain of all his comforts. God never called for a ſacrifice to reconcile himſelf to man; but loved man ſo infinitely, that he was pleaſed to bruiſe his Son for our good, to give him to die, in *attestation* of love to ſinners.

The belief, that the great Jehovah was offended with his creatures to that degree, that nothing but the death of Chriſt, or the endleſs miſery of mankind, could appeaſe his anger, is an idea that has done more injury to the chriſtian religion, than the writings of all its oppoſers, for many centuries. The error has been fatal to the life and ſpirit of the religion of Chriſt in our world; all thoſe principles which are to be dreaded by men, have been believed to *exist* in *God*, and profeſſors have been moulded into the image of their Deity, and become more cruel than the uncultivated Savage! A perſecuting inquiſition is a lively repreſentation of the God which profeſſed chriſtians have believed in, ever ſince the apoſtacy. It is every day's practice, to repreſent the Almighty ſo offended with man that he employs his infinite mind in deviſing *unspeakable tortures*, as retaliations on thoſe with whom he is

offended. Thoſe ideas have ſo obſcured the whole nature of God from us, that the capacious region of the human mind has been darkened with the almoſt impenetrable cloud; even the tender charities of nature have been frozen with ſuch tenets, and the natural friendſhip common to human ſociety, has, in a thouſand inſtances, been driven from the walks of man. But, ſays the reader, is it likely, that perſecution ever roſe from men's believing that God was an enemy to wicked men? Undoubtedly; for, had all profeſſors of chriſtianity believed, that God had compaſſion on the ignorant, and thoſe who are out of the way, how could they have perſecuted thoſe whom they believed in an error? But, with contrary views, thoſe who profeſſed to believe in Chriſt, who profeſſed to be the real diſciples of him who taught his diſciples to *love* their *enemies*, have been the fomenters of perſecution; they have perſecuted, *even unto death*, thoſe who could not *believe in all the abſurdities* in *orthodox creeds*. It may be aſked, if thoſe animoſities did not ariſe from pride, ambition and carnal mindedneſs? I anſwer, yes; and ſo does the *God* in whom perſecuting *chriſtians believe*, for they form a God altogether like unto themſelves; therefore, while they vainly

fancy they are in the ſervice of the true God, they are following the dictates of pride and unlawful ambition, the natural productions of the carnal mind; and atonement is the only remedy for the evil.

Men are diſſatisfied with the Almighty and his providence, they are diſſatisfied with, and are enemies of one another; whereas our true happineſs conſiſts in loving God and our neighbors. Men in poſſeſſion of vile appetites, purſue, with greedineſs, their gratification; but ſtill, they retain their wants, their ſouls are allied to heaven and holineſs, and can never be happy without them. They are conſcious of ſin, and feel condemnation reſting on their minds; they look forward to the awful ſcene of a diſſolution, and their ſouls ſtart back with horror. *Death* is the *King of terrors* to the unreconciled; how awful are the thoughts of death to thoſe whoſe hopes are only the feeble productions of their fears and wants, unſupported with divine evidence! O, how neceſſary is atoning grace, on ſuch an occaſion, whereby a divine confidence may be enjoyed; the value thereof cannot be eſtimated by earthly treaſures; all the ſhining duſt of India, and the riches of the ſouth, are poverty, when compared with the riches of a reconciled mind.

Without atonement, God's glorious design, in the everlasting welfare of his offspring, man, could never be effected; the ordination of an infinitely merciful God could never be carried into effect. The Almighty must not be deprived of the means of accomplishing his gracious designs. We read of his covenant with day and night, which cannot be broken; but it would be broken at once, should the causes cease that produce their changes. So of the covenant of eternal mercy, the testament of eternal life, it must be put in force by the death of the testator, and its life and immortal glory be brought to light through his resurrection. Let it be understood, that it is man who receives the atonement, who stands in need of reconciliation, who, being dissatisfied, needs satisfaction; and not place those imperfections & wants in him who is infinite in his fullness; and the doctrine of atonement may be sought for in the nature of things, and found to be rational to the understanding.

That *man receives* the *atonement*, was evidently the opinion of St. Paul, see Romans v. 11. "And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we* have now *received* the *atonement*." Were there a single passage in the scriptures that would reach *half as*

far, in proving, that *God* received the atonement, as the one juſt quoted does to prove that *man* received it. the matter might be conſidered more diſputable than it now is.

We read, that men are enenies to God, by wicked works, which teaches us that *enmity* is wickednefs : Should we then dare to ſay, that God is our enemy ? It is wrong for us to be enemies even to thoſe who injure us, much more to thoſe who never had it in their power to do us any harm. I wiſh to aſk, did any of God's creatures ever *injure him ?* Surely not, Why then does he turn our enemy ? He commends us to love our enemies, that we may be like him ; but if *he hates his enemies*, *we must hate ours*, if we would be like *him*. If he is *not our enemy*, *he* needs *no atonement*. But if *men* are *enemies* to *God*, *they need* an *atonement*, to bring them to love him who loves them.

Here the reader will obſerve, that we ſhun thoſe difficulties which have repreſented the goſpel of Chriſt ſo inconſiſtent. We now view the Almighty the ſame, yeſterday, to day and forever ; by no means changed in his diſpoſition towards his creatures, but always deſigning and working all things for their good. Here is no need of the ſelf contradictory notion of altering an unalterable being ; of ſatis-

fying an infinite diſſatisfaction ; of reconciling a being who was never unreconciled ; of producing love in love itſelf ; of cauſing an eternal unchangeable friend to be friendly, or of offering a ſacrifice to the eternal Father of our ſpirits, to cauſe him to love and have mercy on his offspring.

How much more reaſonable it is, to ſuppoſe *ourselves* in need of thoſe alterations. But unhappily, men have looked at Deity through the medium of a carnal mind, and have formed *all their* evil tempers in *Jehovah ;* like the deceived aſtronomer, who fancied he ſaw a monſter in the ſun, occaſioned by a fly on his glaſs. This creature being in the medium of ſight, was ſuppoſed to be in the object beheld ; and though it was ſmall in itſelf, and would have appeared ſo, could it have been ſeen where it was ; yet, carrying it into the ſun, it magnified to an enormous ſize. So it is with our vile and ſinful paſſions, could we behold them in ourſelves, and view them as they are, they would appear in their finite and limited ſphere ; but the moment we form thoſe paſſions in Deity, they magnify to infinity. Let a council of aſtronomers be called, who are all deceived by the fly ; let them conſult on the bigneſs of the monſter, calculate how long it has been growing, and how ſoon it may wholly ab-

the ſun; let them endeavor to account for its cauſe, and analyze its conſtitution, inform us the degrees of heat that its lungs ſuſtain, and how many degrees hotter it is than iron can be heat in a furnace. But here is room for diſagreement, which may give riſe to great diſputations. To one, it appears much larger than to another; they cannot judge alike, with regard to its age, nor how much larger it will grow; ſome are ready to diſpute its being a living creature, fancying it may be an opaque body. They are all agreed that there is a phenomenon in the ſun, but diſpute, and even quarrel, about its peculiarities. What would become of all their calculations, the moment they ſhould diſcover the fly? All would be gone, at once, and the ſun would be relieved of the burden of ſo ponderous a monſter.

How many various calculations have Divines made, on the *fury* and *wrath* which they have diſcovered in God! How much they have preached and written, on the awful ſubject; and how many ways they have invented, to appeaſe ſuch wrath and vengeance! When we come to ſee the error, and find thoſe principles in ourſelves, all thoſe notions vaniſh at once. The fly on the glaſs might eaſily have been removed, or deſtroyed; but had there been a monſter in the ſun, what calculations

could mortals have made, to remove it? Enmity in man may be overcome with love; but, did it exist in God, it must be infinite and eternal.

To conclude, the supposition, that Deity receives the atonement, or any possible advantage from the gospel plan, whereby an alteration is effected in him, for the better, amounts to the inexplicable absurdity of making omniscience more wise, omnipotence more powerful, justice more just; and of giving love the power of loving, of making mercy more merciful, truth more true, and goodness better; for these are the seven spirits of God, which are in all the earth, and they are without the shadow of turning.

Having shown, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, the necessity of atonement, and where satisfaction must be made and reconciliation take place, I shall pass, to make some inquiries into

The personage of the Mediator who makes the Atonement, and his ability for performing the work.

I have already stated some of the absurdities contained in the opinions of most christians, respecting the Mediator; I shall now be a little more particular on the subject.

I shall contend that the Mediator is a *created dependent* being. That he is a

created being is proved from Rev. iii. 14, where he is ſaid to be "the beginning of the creation of God." His dependency is proved, by his frequent prayers to the Father. That he acknowledged a ſuperior, when on earth, is evident, from many paſſages which might be quoted. See St. John v. 19. Chriſt here ſays, "The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do." He acknowledged a ſuperior in wiſdom, ſee Matthew xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." This paſſage implies, that he did not know of that day himſelf. St. Mark is ſtill more explicit, ſee chap. xiii. 32, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father." And further, that he acknowledges a ſuperior, even in his riſen glory, may be proved from his own words to his ſervant John, on the Iſle of Patmos, ſee Rev. iii. 12, "Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of *my* God, and he ſhall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is New Jeruſalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name." Four times in the above paſſage, he acknowledges a be-

ing whom he worſhips. Again, ſee Pſalm xlv. 7, "Thou loveſt righteouſneſs and hateſt wickedneſs, *because* God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy fellows" The reader will obſerve, I have ventured to put the word *because*, in the room of the word *therefore*, in this quotation; but I have not done it, without the authority of a former tranſlation. The difference is ſo eſſential, I cannot diſpenſe with it. Obſerve, the writer of the Pſalm addreſſes one God, and ſpeaks in his addreſs of another, ſee verſe 6, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This God is dependent on another, expreſſed in the 7th verſe, *Because* God, thy God, hath anointed thee, &c. The names, *God*, *Lord*, and *everlasting Father*, are applied to Chriſt, I ſhall not diſpute; neither ſhall I diſpute the propriety of it: But I do not admit, that they mean the ſelf exiſtent Jehovah, when applied to the Mediator. In the quotation from the Pſalm, Chriſt is ſaid to be anointed *above his fellows*. Fellows are equals. Who are Chriſt's *equals?* Perhaps the reader may ſay, they are the Father and the Holy Spirit; but I can hardly believe, that Chriſt was anointed with the oil of gladneſs above his Father, neither do I believe any one will contend for it. I am ſenſible that God ſpeaks, by

the prophet, of ſmiting the man who is his *fellow*; but this fellowſhip muſt be different from the one juſt ſpoken of, and ſtands only in an official ſenſe. The reader will then aſk, if I would conſider the Mediator no more than equal with men? I anſwer, yes, were it not, that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows. See Phillippians ii. 9, "Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." For this exaltation and name, he was dependent on his Father, and received them from him. This name, which is above every name, is the name of God, named on Jeſus. It will be ſaid Chriſt taught the people, that *he* and his *Father* were *one*. I grant he did, and if that proves him to be eſſentially God, the argument muſt run farther than the objector would wiſh to have it. See St. John xvii. 11, Chriſt prays that his diſciples may be *one*, even as *he* and his *Father* are *one*. The oneneſs of the Father and Son, is their union and agreement in the great work which he has undertaken; and he prayed that his diſciples might be as well agreed in the goſpel of ſalvation, as he and his Father were, ſee verſe 18, "As thou haſt ſent me into the world, ſo have I alſo ſent them into the world." The Father of all mer-

cies sent his Son Jesus into the world, for a certain purpose; and there was a perfect agreement between them, in all things. He says, he came not to do *his own will*, but the *will* of *him* who sent him. And again, My meat and drink, is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish *his* work.

The President of the United States sends a minister to negociate a peace at a foreign court; this minister must conduct according to the authority which he derives from him, by whom he is sent; and as far as he does, he is, in his *official character*, the *power* that sent him. It is evident, *Christ received* the *power* which he exercises in the work which he hath undertaken, and that his *kingdom* was *given* to him, which goes to prove, he did not eternally possess them; see Dan. vii. 14. "And there was *given* him dominion and glory, and a kingdom." According to the prophecy here quoted, the dominion, glory and kingdom of Christ were *given* him. The people whom he is to rule are *given* him, see Psalm ii. 8. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." St. Matthew xxviii. 18, Jesus sath, "All *power* is *given* unto me in heaven and earth." Chap. xi. 27, "All things are *delivered* unto me of

my Father." These and many more paſſages are found in ſacred writ, in ſupport of the dependence of the Mediator on the Supreme Eternal, and that he derives his power and glory from him. But if Chriſt be eſſentially God, all thoſe ſcriptures ſeem without juſt ſignification.

Chriſt is ſaid to be the "image of the inviſible God, and the firſt born of every creature." His being the *first born* of every creature agrees with his being the *beginning* of the *creation* of God. It is plain to me, from ſcripture, that the Mediator is the firſt human ſoul which was *created*, as Adam was the firſt man that was formed; and that he is, *in ſpirit*, the Father of every human creature, as much as Adam is in the fleſh. Therefore Chriſt ſaith, as it is written, "Behold I and the children that thou haſt given me."

It is written that man was created in the *image* of *God;* and, by the light of the Goſpel, St. Paul ventured to aſſert, that Chriſt was this image. The reader will do well to obſerve, that the *image* of a perſon and the *perſon* are not eſſentially one, but ſome knowledge of a perſon may be obtained of a perſon by his true image. Chriſt being the image of God, it is by him we learn the nature of the Father. Chriſt ſaith "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son re-

vealeth him." Again, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." St. Paul is particular, on this subject, in his first Epistle to Timothy, see chap. ii. verse 5, "For there is *one God*, and one Mediator between God and man, the *man* Christ Jesus." It seems, by this testimony, that St. Paul was a stranger to the notion of Christ's being *essentially* God, as it would be improper to call him a man, were that the case. If it be argued, that Christ is God and man both, I ask, was it the whole divine nature which constituted the divinity of Christ? If this question be answered in the affirmative, I desire to know where that divinity is which constitutes the other two persons in the Godhead. If the question be answered in the negative, and it be argued, that the divinity which Christ possessed was an emanation from Jehovah, it is coming directly to what I contend for, viz. that he is a created being.

As we have seen from the prophecy of Daniel, that Christ received his kingdom; so we are taught, by St. Paul, that he will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, when he has accomplished the grand object of his reign, see 1 Cor. xv. 24. 25. 26. 27, 28, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered* up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have

put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be *subject* unto him that put all things under him, that *God* may be *all* in *all*.

Enough, perhaps, is written, on this part of my query, to make the matter plain to the reader, although much more might be quoted from the scriptures, in support of what I have argued.

I next inquire, has the Mediator power or ability, to perform the work of atonement, which is the reconciliation of the world to God? Those scriptures, with their connexions, which I have quoted to prove the Mediator's dependency, abundantly prove the sufficiency of his power to accomplish the work in which he is engaged. If all power in heaven and earth is committed to Christ, no doubt can be entertained of its sufficiency. If the whole system of law in moral nature is subservient to the designs of the Redeemer, and if he holds in his hands the power of moral government, it certainly must be at his op-

tion, whether men ſhall be reconciled to God or not.

It may not be amiſs to enquire, in this place, whether men, in their individual capacity, have the power of moral government? If they have, the great work of reconciliation might be performed by them, which would render the miſſion of Chriſt unneceſſary. We ought not to ſuppoſe the Almighty ever purpoſed more than one way, to produce the ſame event; if he has given ability to each individual to effect a complete reconciliation in himſelf, it is not conſiſtent to believe that this work of reconciliation will be done by a Mediator; but if the work of reconciling *all things* to God is conſigned to Chriſt, it is not reaſonable to believe we have power to perform it ourſelves. And I think it will not be deemed admiſſible, that we have power to hinder this work of reconciliation, as that would, in effect, deny the truth of all power being given to Chriſt. We ought to conſider, that Chriſt was by no means ignorant of man; that he needed none to teſtify of man, as he knew what was in man. He knew the moral diſtance which man had wandered from God, he knew all the expenſe of recovering him to holineſs and happineſs; and it appears rational, that he knew whether he poſſeſſed ability to defray this expenſe or not; and

if he knew he did not poſſeſs this ability, he would not have undertaken it. We ought not to ſuppoſe the Mediator would act as unwiſely as a man who undertakes to build a large houſe, without firſt counting the coſt, to know if he be able to finiſh a building ſo expenſive; or as a King would do, who ſhould make war on another King, without firſt conſulting whether he was able to contend with the double numbers which his adverſary commanded.

St. Paul, writing to the Coloſſians, ſaith, of Chriſt, he is the firſt born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre eminence; for it pleaſed the Father, that in him, all fullneſs ſhould dwell; and that the Father had made peace, through the blood of the croſs; and then informs them for what this peace was made, ſee chap. i. verſe 20, "By him to reconcile *all* things unto himſelf: by him, I ſay, whether they be things on earth, or things in heaven." In Iſaiah ix. 6, we have a beautiful prophetic teſtimony of the power and kingdom of the Saviour. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a ſon is given, and the government ſhall be upon his ſhoulder, and his name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace." And in the beginning of the next verſe, the extent of his dominion is

ſpoken of. "And of the increaſe of his government and peace, there ſhall be no end." There is a great number of like paſſages, which, in the courſe of this work, I ſhall have occaſion to introduce; but enough is already quoted, to ſhow for what this power was given to Chriſt, and that it is ſufficient to accompliſh the end intended. Again, it may be reaſonable to argue, that if the Almighty committed power into the hands of Chriſt, for the performance of any thing whatever, if there ſhould be found, at laſt, a want of power for the work intended, it would prove a want of wiſdom, in the giver of ſuch power. No one, who profeſſes to believe at all in Chriſt, will diſpute his powrr for the performance of all his will: But I wiſh to have the reader ſatisfied, in reſpect to his power, and in what it conſiſts, which, to make it as clear as poſſible, I connect with my laſt particular in this general inquiry, which is

ATONEMENT IN ITS NATURE.

I have already obſerved, that atonement and reconciliation are the ſame. Reconciliation is a renewal of love, and love is the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, of which St. Paul ſpeaks, in Romans

viii. 2, by which he was made free from the law of ſin. The ſoul, when governed by the law of ſin which is in the members, of which St. Paul ſpeaks in Romans vii. 23, is in a ſtate of unreconciliation to the law of the Spirit. And it is by the force and power of the law of love, in Chriſt, that the ſoul is delivered from the government of the law of ſin; the proceſs of this deliverance is the work of atonement, or reconciliation.

The reader will now ſee, with eaſe, that, that power which cauſes us to hate ſin, and love holineſs, is the power of Chriſt, whereby atonement is made. All the law and the prophets reſted on this ſpirit of love, by which alone they can be fulfilled. This eternal ſpirit of love is the *word*, or *logos*, which was, in the beginning, with God, and was God, which was hidden behind the letter of the law, and in the cabaliſtical allegories of the prophets, until it brake forth in the official character of Jeſus and rent the veil of the temple from top to bottom. Our Saviour, in his official character, is always called by the name, or names, which is, or are, applicable to God, manifeſt in the *fleſh*, which figuratively means the *letter* of the law; this circumſtance will fully account for all the ſcriptures which my opponent would

urge, in support of Jesus' being essentially God.

Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them; the law is as far fulfilled, in the soul, as it is brought to love God, in his adorable image, Jesus; and a complete fulfilment of the law and the prophets, will effect love, in every soul, on whom the law, in a moral sense, is binding.

Let it be asked, by what means are we brought to love God? Answer, "We love him, because he first loved us." God's love to us is antecedent to our love to him, which refutes the notion of God's receiving the atonement; but the idea that the manifestation of God's love to us, causes us to love him, and brings us to a renewal of love, (in which spirit we all stood, in our spiritual head, Jesus, before formation; and from which, we, in a certain sense, elapsed, after being made subject to vanity) is perfectly consonant to the necessity of atonement, it shows us what atonement is, and the power which the Mediator must have and exercise, in order to reconcile all things to God.

The method, by which we are brought to love any object, whatever, is, by seeing, or thinking we see, some beauty in the object; and our love is always in

proportion to the apparent good qualities of the object seen.

While our minds are darkened, by the veil on the heart, in reading Moses, so that the beauties of the ministration of life are hidden from our eyes, and its excellent glories are out of our sight, it is impossible that we should love Christ, or his word. Yet, during this darkness, we must love something; therefore, as sin and the vanities of elementary life present the greatest beauty to our eyes, of any objects which we behold, our affections are placed on those corruptible things.

Now I call up the question again, has Jesus power to cause us to love holiness, and to hate sin? answer, yes, if he has power to reveal the divine beauties of the word, to remove the letter and its administration which are death, to take the veil from off the heart, and to cause us to see himself altogether lovely.

When a sinner views God as an enemy, and grumbles concerning his being hard and austere, when he feels an aversion to him, and wishes to avoid his presence, it is certain the Son hath not revealed the Father to that soul. The ideas thus entertained of God are altogether wrong, and the mind that entertains them has no just conceptions of the Almighty. But blessed be the express image of the Invisi-

ble; he hath power to reveal the true character of the Father, to remove the veil from the heart, and to let the fun beams of divine light gently into the underſtanding; then God appears altogether lovely, and the chiefeſt among ten thouſand, while the ſoul in ecſtacy embraces the brightneſs of his glory, crying "My Lord, and my God." But the idea of the *letter* is ſo fixed in the minds of chriſtian people, in general, that the *veil* of the *law* is as fully on their minds, as it was on the Phariſees of old, which cauſed them to be blind to their Meſſiah when he came.

Chriſtians have, for a long time, believed, that the *temporal death* of Chriſt made an atonement for ſin, and that the *literal blood* of the man who was crucified, has efficacy to cleanſe from guilt; but ſurely this is carnality, and carnal mindedneſs, if I have any knowledge of the apoſtle's meaning, where he ſays, "To be carnally minded, is death."

The *letter killeth*, but the *ſpirit giveth life*. The apoſtles were made able miniſters of the new teſtament, not of the *letter*, but of the *ſpirit*. Chriſt ſaith, "except ye *eat my flesh*, and *drink my blood*, ye have no *life* in you." Muſt we underſtand this in a *literal* ſenſe? If we do, how ſhall we underſtand what he further ſays of this matter? "The *flesh* profiteth no-

thing; the words which I ſpeak, they are *ſpirit*, and they are life."

The apoſtacy of the Jews happened, in conſequence of the lips of the prieſts not preſerving knowledge; they fell from the *ſpirit* of the law, were loſt in the wilderneſs of the letter, and therefore were blinded indeed. This was a figure of the more dreadful apoſtacy of chriſtians, as were various other circumſtances recorded in the old teſtament. The chriſtian apoſtacy happened, in the ſame way; and the church has been led into the wilderneſs of the letter, by an *hireling prieſthood*, who knew nothing of the *ſpirit* of the law; who have preached, in the name of the Lord, the *letter*, which *killeth*, in room of the *ſpirit*, which giveth *life*.

The *literal* death of the man, Chriſt Jeſus, is figurative; and all the life we obtain by it, is, by learning what it repreſented. The *literal body* of Jeſus repreſented the whole letter of the law, with all the allegories contained in the word of prophecy. The death of the body of Jeſus, repreſented the death and deſtruction of the letter, when the ſpirit comes forth, burſting the veil thereof, which is repreſented by the reſurrection of Jeſus from the dead. Agreeably to this, the reader will underſtand all the ſacrifices, under the law, by

which the High Priests entered within the veil.

" Being thus enabled to pass from the *letter* to the spirit, we see what death it is, which is the proper sacrifice for sin, and what blood it is that cleanses from guilt. The *blood* is said to be the *life*, it is therefore the spirit or life of the law which does away sin, and gives life to the soul.

I am sensible there are thousands, who profess christianity, who are blind enough to object and say, " Then the gospel has nothing to do, in the salvation of mankind." But suffer me to say, the gospel is nothing but the spirit of the law, which is the word, or logos, spoken of in the law, brought forth from the shadows of the first dispensation. To believe in any other atonement, than the putting off the *old man*, with his deeds, and the putting on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness, is carnal mindedness, and is death.

There is nothing in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, that can do away sin, but love ; and we have reason to be eternally thankful, that love is stronger then death, that many waters cannot quench it, nor the floods drown it ; that it hath power to remove the moral maladies of mankind, and to make us free from the law of sin and death ,toreconcile us to

God, and to wash us pure, in the blood, or life, of the everlasting covenant. O love, thou great Physician of souls, what a work hast thou undertaken! All souls are thy patients; prosperous be thy labors, thou bruiser of the head of carnal mind.

In this view of the subject, we may see how the divine grace of reconciliation may be communicated to those who have never been privileged with the volume of divine revelation, and who have never heard the name of a Mediator proclaimed, as the only way of life and salvation. I have no doubt but thousands, whose education has taught them to look on the christian religion as an imposture, may possess a good degree of this love, which is the spirit of life in Christ Jesus; and though none can feel or experience this divine animation, only through the medium of the second Adam, I do not conceive that its agency is confined particularly to names, sects, denominations, people or kingdoms.

The *word*, which is nigh us, even in our hearts and mouths, is every where, operating, in some degree, in all hearts. The enmity, which God put between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, is every where felt, and the two children are struggling in every breast. When the creature like nature, or the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, leads the

whole man captive, it is then that the ſoul is in a ſtate of unreconciliation and death; but when the heavenly child, which, after God, is created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs, binds the ſtrong man armed, and whiſpers heavenly invitations to the ſoul, revealing himſelf in the underſtanding, the ſoul immediately ceaſes to confer with fleſh and blood, beholds with inexpreſſible admiration the heavenly beauties of the new nature, is moulded into its likeneſs, and experimentally becomes a child of God; the flaming ſword is removed from the place of light; the way to the tree of life is opened, and the ſoul enters by the anchor of hope within the veil, where the cherubims are diſarmed of the flaming ſword, and ſtand looking down on the mercy ſeat, where God communes with his people. Thus, by the ſpirit of the word, the ſoul is brought to a ſweet communion with God, it feels its eternal ſonſhip, and rejoices therein, with joy unſpeakable and full of glory.

Perhaps the chriſtian reader will here pauſe, and ſay, my ſoul can witneſs, that, what the author writes, is true; but then, he does not tell of a regular *law work*; without which, the ſoul can never be brought to taſte thoſe delicacies in the goſpel proviſions. To this obſervation, I re-

ply, I believe there are as egregious errors crept into the chriſtian church, in this particular, as in any thing relative to the chriſtian religion; and I further believe, that, among thoſe, who have really taſted, that the Lord is gracious, there are ſuch differences, on the above point, that, in many inſtances, they amount to a diſfellowſhip, and tend greatly to deſtroy the bleſſed work begun in the ſoul. But thoſe errors undoubtedly originate in ſome theories which are produced by the wiſdom of the carnal mind, which is ſo oppoſed to the wiſdom from above, that it is always endeavoring to introduce ſomething that may ſerve to raiſe animoſities, and to ſow diſcord among brethren.

Some, who, by the force of a falſe education, have been led to believe, that God is an enemy to the ſinner, have ſuppoſed they were every day expoſed to the juſt vengeance of the Almighty, and have fancied that they could clearly ſee the juſtice of God, in their eternal baniſhment from heaven and happineſs; and they have been ſo wrecked, on this wheel of torture, as to be deprived of ſleep and every kind of repoſe, for a tedious time, ſome longer, and ſome ſhorter. Awful dreams, fraught with the moſt terrifying imaginations, have corroded the mind; and ſometimes, a burning lake of fire and brimſtone has

been painted to the mind so clearly, that, for several days together, the poor frightened soul would feel as if it were on the brink of a precipice, expecting the next moment to be the fatal one. In this awful situation, it pleases God to manifest himself to soul; and in a moment, all those frightful imaginations are dispersed, and an universal calm takes possession of the whole region of the mind. The soul now rejoices, as a captive set at liberty, or a pardoned criminal; and there is nothing to be heard, from him, but the praises of his Benefactor. In this hour of joy, should he hear ten thousand singing praises to his Redeemer, he would not wish to stop them, to know whether they had all felt just as he had, before he knew the truth. But, in a short time, carnal mind, still alive in the members, begins to make its intrusions, and in a very deceitful way. It pretends to wish to help the soul along in religion, and says, there must be a close examination, it will not do to harbor errors, &c. But, in room of setting the creature to examine himself, it sets him to examine his brother; his brother happens to be one, who, in fact, loves Christ and his word, and, to all appearance, walks in the path of obedience; but, he is one, whose education was not quite so perverse as was his, and one who was taught, that

God is an enemy to ſin, not to ſinners; that he will chaſtiſe, for iniquity, but that God is not ſo incenſed as ſome imagine. This brother cannot tell all that the interrogator has experienced, and is, therefore, rejected, for not telling a good *law work*.

It is now poſſible, that the reader is more ſurpriſed than before, and will ſay, the author does not talk like a chriſtian; and, feeling ſome diſagreeable emotion, he thinks he will read no further. But ſtop, dear ſir; that determination may ariſe wholly from a want of divine charity. If you are, in reality, a chriſtian, and ſtand in the liberty wherewith Chriſt has made you free, what you here read will do you no harm.

I am now about to examine your *law work*, as you call it, and ſhall argue, that, what you call law, is only a creature of falſe education.

Before you found peace, you thought you could ſee the juſtice of God, in your eternal excluſion from heaven and happineſs. Now I aſk, can you find, that God ever gave a law to man which required endleſs miſery, in caſe of diſobedience? Sure I am, the ſcriptures ſpeak of none, neither do the dictates of good reaſon admit of its exiſtence. Perhaps my opponent may ſay, we are not to uſe our *reaſon*

in matters of religion. I anſwer, if we are not to underſtand the things of God, by ſcripture and reaſon, I am at a loſs to know how to come at them. I have before argued this point particularly, in order to ſhow, that ſuch a penalty does not exiſt in the the law of God. Did you think, an excluſion from heaven and happineſs would be an excluſion from holineſs and righteouſneſs? Did you ever ſee the juſtice of God, in your being ſinful, unholy and impure? You anſwer, no. Then you never ſaw the juſtice of God, in your endleſs excluſion from heaven and happineſs.

A falſe education has riveted the error in the minds of thouſands, that God's law required endleſs miſery to be inflicted on the ſinner. How often do profeſſed chriſtians addreſs the Almighty, and ſay, "Hadſt thou been *just* to have marked iniquity, we ſhould, long ſince, have been in the grave, with the dead, and in hell, with the damned." This addreſs amounts to nothing more, or leſs, than a complimental accuſation againſt God, for injuſtice! It ſurpriſes me, to think how profeſſed chriſtians will contend for the honor and glory of God, in a way that reders his character infinitely inglorious and diſhonorable.

Further, you believed, (you say) before you were a believer in the truth, that you stood in danger, every moment, of falling into endless misery. I would ask, if that were true, which you believed, before you believed the truth? I further ask, are you now exposed to those dreadful torments! You will say, you hope for the better. And what is it that now preserves you from such danger? You confess it is your Saviour. But was it not he who preserved you before your conversion? And are you more safe in his hands at one time than at another?

Some have gone so far, in their *law work*, as to say, they saw the justice of God so plainly, and it appeared so beautiful, that they were perfectly willing to be endlessly miserable, according to its requirements. Such christians will not allow, that a person can be savingly converted, without being first willing to be endlessly miserable. This, I must confess, is a law work as unreconcilable to scripture and reason, as it is corrosive to the mind. The amount of it is this, I see so much beauty and divine excellency, in the justice of God, that I am perfectly willing to exist, to all eternity, in rebellion against it! I wish to know, what the soul has to be thankful for, in the work of salvation? If it be brought to be willing to be endlessly

miserable, it cannot be thankful for the gift of eternal life. Again, if a willingness to be damned, is a good situation, the soul ought to continue in it; and then, *hell* and *endless woe* would be as valuable a prize, for which to run, in the christian race, as *heaven* and *immortality*.

It is generally believed, the Savior strives, by his spirit, to bring the creature into a state of grace and salvation; and that the devil strives, with all his wily arts, to get the soul into hell and endless torments. Now, if these things be so, to which is the soul reconciled when it is willing to be endlessly miserable? That multitudes have been in great fear of being rejected by the Almighty, at last, I have no doubt; for I confess those torments have been mine, in no small degree. But I contend, it is *impossible* for any one to be *willing* to be *endlessly miserable*. Happiness always was, and always will be, the grand object of all rational beings; and to reverse this object would be to reverse man from a reasonable, to an unreasonable creature.

The above notion of law work, has been the awful mean of driving multitudes of blinded mortals into as much despair, as the mind is capable of. Honest hearted persons, who do not wish to be deceived, or to deceive others, knowing that they

never felt willing to be damned, and being told they must be willing, in order to be saved, have supposed, that God had already reprobated their fearful souls to endless ruin! Others have been so deceived, as to think they had better be willing to be *damned*, than not to be *saved;* desiring salvation so much, they think they had better be *willing* to be shut out of heaven forever, than to miss of salvation, and have, either honestly or hypocritically, said, they were willing to be damned; expecting great favors in consequence of the confession. The moment we have a just idea, of the spirit of the law making an atonement for sin, all those absurdities and contradictions are removed, and their causes taken away.

I doubt not but God communicates his grace to persons laboring under every kind of deception; and in respect to that grace, no dispute arises among believers. Their disputes arise, from notions which they entertain before they were enlightened, or from certain inventions of their own, afterwards, which do not arise from the spirit of truth.

The divine efficacy of this atoning grace may be communicated to the most vile and profligate person in the world, and stop him in his full career of wickedness; it can show the sinner, in a moment, the de-

formity of sin, and the beauty of holiness. In other instances, the morally virtuous are led a long time in concern and great trouble, about themselves, before they find him of whom Moses and the prophets did write.

God is not confined to character, time, or place, to work the work of atonement in the soul; he does all things well, and in the best time and way; and christians do very wrong, to contend about those differences which sin and deception caused in them, before they knew Christ.

Two persons are discoursing about the agreeable flavor of the pine-apple; one says to the other, it tastes very differently from what I expected it would before I tasted it; I thought it was a crabbed sour. Says the other, I am sure you never tasted of a pine-apple; for, before I tasted of one, I thought it was a disagreeable bitter. Thus they dispute, each in his turn arguing, that the other had never tasted of the fruit, because they had different ideas about it, before they actually had any knowledge of it.

Would you not, kind reader, advise those disputants to come to a solution of their question, in a different way? Surely you would; and if they could agree, about the real taste of the apple, you would

adviſe them to let their former falſe notions alone.

Then, chriſtian reader, go and do likewiſe, in the religion of Jeſus; and wherever you find a brother, who has, in reality, *tasted* that the Lord is gracious, fellowſhip him, as one initiated into the kingdom of God.

Atonement by Chriſt, was never intended to perform impoſſiblities; therefore, it was never deſigned to make men agree, and live in peace, while they are deſtitute of love one to another; but it is calculated and deſigned to inſpire the mind with that true love which will produce peace in Jeſus. As atonement is a complete fulfilment of the law of the heavenly man, it cauſes its recipient to love God and his fellow creatures, in as great a degree as he partakes of its nature. Aſk one brought out of darkneſs into the marvellous light of the goſpel, how God appears to him; and he will anſwer, more glorious than he can deſcribe. Aſk him, how he feels towards his fellow men; and he will ſay, even of his enemies, he wiſhes them no worſe than to enjoy the bleſſings of divine favor. In times of refreſhing, how many thouſands have been heard to ſpeak of the goodneſs of the Lord, and of the infinite fullneſs of his grace; and with what love, affection and fervency, have they invited

their fellow men to the rich provifion of the gofpel!

The earth, in time of drought, ceafes to be fruitful; the ftreams and fprings thereof are dried up; the fields put off their robes of green, and gardens afford no fragrant delights; but when the heavens give the wonted bleffings in gentle fhowers, how fuddenly is the face of nature changed! The purling rill murmurs thro' the mead, paftures and fields team with vegetation, & gardens bluſh with enameled beauties. So the foul, unwatered with the rain of righteoufnefs, and deſtitute of the waters of eternal life, is like a barren fig tree that yields no wholefome fruit. But behold the tranſition; the moment atoning grace is effective in the mind, the parched ground becomes a pool, and the thirfty land, ſtreams of water. The foul is like the earth that drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom they are dreſſed; and, like a garden well watered and cultivated, yielding all manner of precious fruits. Look on the trees, after autumn has plucked their leaves, and winter frozen their trunks and limbs: Without faith in ſpring, their future life would be hopeleſs; but wait for the ſeaſon of nature's appointment, when the increaſing majeſty of the ſun-beams gently removes

the chains of froſt, and warm zephyrs are breathed on the ſurrounding ſnow, removing it from on the land; the embryo bloſſom, nicely concealed in froſt, now ſwells with genial heat; and the leaf, ſo nicely folded in winter's cheſt, now diſplays its matchleſs green, and the whole foreſt rejoices in expanded delights. So, if we look on man, in the ſinful Adam, there is no appearance of heavenly life, or divine animation; the ſoul is bound in the fetters of ſin, frozen with covetouſneſs, and apparently dead in the winter of iniquity. But behold the ſun of righteouſneſs ariſing with healing in his wings, removing ſin, by the power of grace, and killing moral death, with divine life and animation, and cauſing the ſoul to rejoice in the kingdom of grace and glory. Then it may be rightly ſaid, "The winter is paſt, the rains are over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, and the time of ſinging is come." How myſterious are the ways of God! What infinite depths of wiſdom lie concealed from the ſight of mortals! He, who varies the ſeaſons of the year, and diverſifies nature through ſo great a number of changes, without loſing the ſmalleſt particle of matter, can carry his rational creatures through all the diſpenſations deſigned in infinite wiſdom, without loſing any, and conſummate the whole in glory at laſt.

Suffer me, kind reader, in my faithfulneſs with the ſaints, to excite a cloſe examination. It can be of no avail, to believe we are partakers of atoning grace, unleſs that is really the caſe. I am of opinion, that many may be deceived in theſe things; ſome may ſuppoſe they are experimentally acquainted with them, when, in reality, they have no other evidence of it, than that ſome godly miniſter, as they ſuppoſe him to be, can fellowſhip them as chriſtians; while others do, in reality, feel this divine ſpirit of grace, in its atoning operations, but dare not ſuffer themſelves to believe it, becauſe they have not obtained the approbation of ſome, in whom they have been taught to put confidence.

I would, therefore, note ſome faithful evidences, in this caſe, which will not deceive us; and in doing this, I ſhall keep the reader cloſe to the ſpirit of the law, which is love to God and man. From theſe two points and their conſequences, all the evidence which can be obtained muſt be deduced. The queſtion then is, do you love God? If you anſwer yes, I aſk, why do you love him? and why do you endeavor to ſerve him? If you anſwer becauſe it is your duty, and you fear his rod, if you do not; I tell you, you are

ceived; you have no real love to your Maker. Undoubtedly you would say, (as many vain professors have said) 'If you were certain of salvation in the world to come, you would do all the mischief here you could.' If the gospel of Jesus Christ has any enemies in this wicked world, you are of that class. Your profession of christianity, for forty or fifty years; your attention to church ordinances, and the mighty parade you have made in a round of (what you call) religious duties, has only served to paint you like a whited sepulchre: You lack the one thing needful, which is *love*. You are ready to oppose all professors of christianity who do not subscribe to your articles of faith. The weapons of your warfare are a tongue of slander, and a spirit of persecution; and you are daily raising false accusations against those who faithfully serve the Lord in spirit and in truth. The pharisees of old made as great professions of religion as you do, and were as punctual to those customs, whereby they made void the law, as you are to those, whereby you make void the gospel; and like you, they were zealous of defending their religion; and in their zeal, they murdered the Lord of life and glory! Perhaps you will say, the author is hard, in his reproofs. I reply, if you, who answer the questions as I have

ſtated, are not of the claſs of which I ſpeak, you will not feel the rebuke; but if you are, you not only deſerve it, but greatly need it. On the other hand, if you can truly ſay, you love the Lord, on account of the divine beauties and excellencies you behold in him; that he is in truth, to you, altogether lovely, and the chiefeſt among ten thouſand; that you delight in his ſervice, becauſe it is your meat and drink to do his will; that your greateſt enjoyment is obedience to his commands, which are joyous and not grievous, and *in keeping* of which, there is *great reward;* let your denomination be what it may, let you live in what part of the world you will, you are a friend to the religion of Jeſus, and you have ſweet communion with him who ſits at the right hand of God. Are you rich in the things of this world, you view all your poſſeſſions at the will, and you wiſh to have them at the diſpoſal, of the Maſter whom you ſerve; are you adorned with titles of human honor, how ſweet is it to lay all theſe things at the feet of him whom you eſteem infinitely honorable. Are you poor in the goods of fortune, you poſſeſs the true riches; are you a diſconſolate widow, behold God is your huſband, and the father of your fatherleſs children.

Atoning grace produces all which the bible means by conviction, or being born of the Spirit; it brings the mind from under the power and conſtitution of the earthly Adam, to live by faith on the Son of God, and to be ruled and governed, even in this life, in a great meaſure, by the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus. It opens eternal things to our view and contemplation; it brings heaven into the ſoul, and clothes the man in his right mind; it inſpires the ſoul with divine meekneſs and boldneſs, at the ſame time. It was this that enabled the apoſtles of our Lord to preach the goſpel, in defiance of the rage of their enemies, and gave them immortal conſolations in their ſufferings for the cauſe of truth. It cauſes the chriſtian to love all God's rational creatures, and to wiſh their ſaving knowledge of the truth; it produces good works in their purity, and all the morality worth the name is founded on it. Its divine power is ſtronger than any poſſible oppoſition, and the gates of hell cannot prevail againſt it; it opens a door of everlaſting hope, and conducts the ſoul, by way of the croſs, to immortality and eternal life. This diſpenſation of atonement is manifeſted through Chriſt, for the reconciliation of all things to God, in his glorious kingdom of holineſs and happineſs.

In this general view of atonement, I come to my laſt inquiry propoſed in this treatiſe, viz.

The Conſequences of Atonement to Mankind.

In this laſt inquiry, I muſt be a little more lengthy, than in either of the former, but I hope not too tedious. What I ſhall contend for, as the conſequences of atonement, is the *univerſal holiness* and *happiness* of mankind, in the final iſſue of the Redeemer's proceſs. In doing this, I will,

First, Make a fair ſtatement of the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation, as I underſtand it.

Secondly, Take notice of the moſt frequent objections ſtated againſt the doctrine, by various denominations. And

Laſtly, Give my reaſons for believing in my general propoſition, from ſcripture and reaſon.

I will make the ſtatement of the doctrine which I believe, as ſhort as poſſible.

1ſt. God created man, in Chriſt the Mediator; in which creation, the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, of which St. Paul ſpeaks to the Romans, was the whole governing principle of his nature.

2d. After the creation of man in this divine conſtitution, it pleaſed the Almigh-

ty to reduce him to a ſtate of formation in fleſh and blood; in which conſtitution, the *law* of *ſin*, which St. Paul ſaid he found in his members, became the governing principle of the whole man.

3d. God has revealed his divine and glorious purpoſe of bringing man back from his *formed* ſtate, and from under the law of the earthly Adam, to his original *created* ſtate, forever to be under the governing power of the law of the heavenly conſtitution.

The objections, of which notice will be taken, ſtand oppoſed to my third propoſition: The firſt that I notice, is found in a propoſition frequently ſtated, by modern divines, thus, 'God, in the great and infinite plan of moral government, conſults the greateſt poſſible good to the whole ſyſtem; and in order for the greateſt poſſible happineſs to be produced, it was neceſſary, that ſome of God's rational creatures ſhould be eternally miſerable; Agreeable to which, all men cannot be ſaved.' This is the only ground, on which an objection can be ſtated againſt univerſal holineſs and happineſs, while we admit the exiſtence of an Infinite Supreme.

I cannot go into an examination of any authorities, on which the above ſtatement is ſuppoſed to ſtand; for I know of none: All I can do, is to examine the ſtatement.

itſelf. It is argued agreeable to this propoſition, that the infinite and inconceivable miſeries of the wicked, in the world to come, will enhance the happineſs of the glorified in heaven.

Againſt theſe ſtatements, I argue, if, in order for the greateſt poſſible happineſs to exiſt, the greateſt poſſible miſery muſt, alſo, exiſt, I wiſh to reverſe the ſubject: Then the propoſition would ſtand thus, In order for the greateſt poſſible *evil* to exiſt, the greateſt poſſible *good* muſt exiſt. Then, if God, in his univerſal plan, has produced as much *good* as was poſſible, he has, alſo, produced as much *evil* as poſſible, which renders the ſtatement, that he conſulted the greateſt poſſible *evil*, as juſt, as that he conſulted the greateſt poſſible *good*. Of courſe, there is no more propriety in calling him *good*, than there is in calling him *bad*.

If it be ſaid I carry this evil, or miſery, too far, even beyond my opponent's meaning, I will endeavor to ſhow him, according to his own ſtatement, that I do not. He ſays, *every degree* of miſery in hell, will produce *many degrees* of happineſs in heaven; if ſo, if the wretched are not made as miſerable as poſſible, the bleſſed cannot be made as happy as poſſible; if they are not made as happy as poſſible, they muſt experience ſome want; and, of

courſe, ſome miſery themſelves. On the other hand, if the wretched be not as miſerable as poſſible, they muſt have in poſſeſſion ſome remaining convenience: Then, neither the greateſt poſſible happineſs, nor the greateſt poſſible miſery, is produced.

Almighty God being put to the neceſſity of making ſome of his rational offſpring eternally miſerable, in order to make the reſt forever happy, may be repreſented by a parent who has ten children; but only proviſions enough to preſerve the lives of five, until he could get more. In this awful dilemma, he ſits down to conſult the *greatest possible good;* ſays to himſelf, if I divide my proviſions equally among my children, all muſt ſurely ſtarve to death; but by neglecting five, I can ſave the lives of the other five, which he finally concludes to do. But I aſk the rational, I petition the reaſonable, I requeſt the impartial, to gueſs the *feelings* of the *father*, on ſuch an occaſion! Before him, are ten children, *all* in the *image* of himſelf; he ſees his own eyes roll in their heads, hears his own voice on their tongues, while his own blood frolics thro' their veins; how could he make the diviſion? how could he decide on one, for a victim? Would he not rather give his own *flesh* to be their *meat*, and his own *blood* to be their *drink*, and fervently pray

for plenty! But is the Almighty poor? Has he not enough, and to ſpare? When the prodigal came home, did the father turn away his brother, ſo that he might have a plenty for him? Is there not fullneſs enough in God, to ſatisfy the wants of all his creatures? Why the neceſſity, then, of making ſome miſerable eternally? My opponent will ſay, the bleſſed are happified, in conſequence of the miſery of the wretched: But what reaſon can be given, for ſuch an idea? How do we look on a perſon, in this world, who manifeſts joy and happineſs in the miſery of one of his fellow creatures? Do we ſay he manifeſts a godlike diſpoſition? Surely no. From whence came charity; from heaven, or hell? If ſouls in heaven poſſeſs it, they cannot be happy in conſequence of the miſery of any rational being; and ſhould the divine principle be found in hell, it would baniſh miſery, and annihilate the place!

Again, if a ſoul in heaven derives happineſs, from ſeeing, ſay one half, or two thirds, of the human race in miſery, would he not yet enjoy more, providing the whole, except himſelf, were in the ſame torment? If it be granted that he would, then, in order for a ſoul to be made as happy as poſſible, the whole human race, except that one, muſt be endleſsly as miſer-

able as poſſible ! If it be argued, that it is not the number or multitudes of individuals who are made miſerable, that thus conſtitutes or enhances the happineſs of the bleſſed, but that it is the nature, juſtice and intenſeneſs of this miſery, which is neceſſary for the above purpoſe, it makes it very plain, that the eternal miſery of *one* would produce as much good, as of ten thouſand, or more.

We have now gone ſo far, even on our opponent's ground, as to ſee, that there is no need of more than one ſoul's being endleſsly miſerable ; and it ſtill further appears to me, that the miſery of this *one* may be diſpenſed with, without departing from what my opponent has acknowledged ; and that, by letting each individual of the human race, for a moment, or any limited time, experience the nature of the miſery contended for, and then giving them a memory to retain it freſh in mind forever ; this muſt, of neceſſity, produce the effect as well, and without the expenſe of a ſingle ſoul. I do not think it would abſolutely require omniſcient wiſdom to concert a better plan than the one I am oppoſing.

Suppoſe we alter the circumſtance of the father and his ten children : Suppoſe the father has proviſions enough for the whole, and his object, in the beſtowing it upon

them, is to cauſe the greateſt poſſible happineſs among his children. Which way would good ſenſe and parental affection chuſe, either to feed five to the full, or ſtarve the reſt to death, that their *dying groans* might give the others a *better appetite*, and *their food* a *good relish*, or to let them all be hungry enough to reliſh their food well, and all alike partake of it?

I will take notice of a certain paſſage of ſcripture, in this place, which ſome have endeavored to accommodate to the argument which I am diſputing; ſee Rev. xiv. 10, 11, "The ſame ſhall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb: and the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up forever and ever: and they have no reſt day nor night, who worſhip the beaſt and his image, and whoſoever receiveth the mark of his name." It is not becauſe I am afraid of wounding this beaſt, or of affronting its rider, that I do not enter into a particular explanation of the paſſage now recited; but becauſe it deſerves the labor of more time than I have to ſpare. However, the idea of my opponent is eaſily refuted; and this is as much as the reader ought to expect, in this

work. The common idea is, that the punishment here spoken of is altogether in eternity, and not in this world of mortality; that it being in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb, it indicates that it affords pleasure in those heavenly mansions where they dwell.

First, I request the reader to observe, that the verbs, *ascendeth*, *have*, *worship*, and *receiveth*, are all in the same tense, which at least favors the idea, that the sulphureous smoke of this torment ascendeth up, at the same time that the tormented *worship* the beast. If the apocalypical beast be worshipped to an endless eternity, it follows that his worshipers will be tormented as long. Until it is proved, that some will worship this beast, in another world, or endlessly, it cannot be proved, from this passage, that any will be tormented, in another world, or endlessly. It is said, in the text, that, the worshippers of the beast have no rest *day* nor *night*. If it can be proved, that *day* and *night* are reckoned in another world, or in eternity, my opponent has better ground for his argument than I think he has.

This beast, undoubtedly, is Antichrist; the worshipers of the beast are apostatized christians of all denominations, since the

chriſtian apoſtacy: They have always been in wars and commotions, and have had no reſt; and as for their being tormented, in all their public worſhip, with *fire* and *brimstone*, no argument is neceſſary, to make it obvious.

Another objection, which has often been ſtated againſt the ſalvation of all men, ſtands in a pretended axiom, viz. 'A God *all mercy* is a God *unjust*.' The force of this pretended axiom, as uſed againſt the ſalvation of all men, is, if God ſhould do juſtly, by all men, he would be an unmerciful being; or, if he ſhould ſhew mercy to all men, he would be an unjuſt being. There is nothing ſelf evident, in this axiom, that I can ſee but its own want of propriety; it repreſents *juſtice* and *mercy* at an eternal *variance*. According to this *axiom*, and the argument deducible from it, juſtice may be compared to a monſtrous *wolf* in purſuit of a number of *lambs*, and *mercy* to a *ſhepherd* who is obiged to give up a large number of them, to gorge his omniverous appetite, while he makes off with the reſt.

I have, already, ſufficiently refuted the idea of juſtice requiring the endleſs miſery of the creature; and, until that notion can be ſupported by ſcripture, or reaſon, an objection againſt the ſalvation of all men, can-

not be ſtated, from the nature of juſtice. I have, alſo, ſhewed, that, in order for juſtice to require the *endless misery* of any moral being, it muſt, of neceſſity, require the *endless continuance of sin*; than which nothing is more abſurd. Again, it is objected, as many are going out of this world daily, in a ſtate of ſinfulneſs and unreconciliation to God, and there being no alteration in the ſoul, for the better, after it leaves this natural life, millions muſt be miſerable, as long as God exiſts. The force of this objection ſtands on the declaration, that there is no alteration for the better, after death. Could this declaration be proved, I grant it would ſubſtantiate a formidable, and (I think) unanſwerable objection againſt the final holineſs and happineſs of all men. I have often heard the objection made, but never heard an evidence brought from ſcripture, or reaſon, to ſupport the declaration. Divines being ſenſible of the want of ſcripture, to ſupport this (their) declaration, have, very liberally, been at the expenſe of making ſome; and the notable paſſage which they have coined, and brought into very frequent uſe, is not to be found in the ſcriptures of the Old, or New Teſtament; but is frequently to be heard from the pulpit, read in many of their writings, and recited by many of their adherents.

It is as follows: "*As the tree falls, so it lies; as death leaves us, so judgment will find us,*" I ſhall not contend about a different explanation, of this addition to the ſcriptures, from the uſual one; but will only ſay, if the thing, which my opponent would prove by it, be true, viz that ſouls cannot be altered for the better, after death, all our chriſtian people muſt remain eternally as unſanctified, as they are in this world of infirmities.

Again, many contend, that God deals with mankind as moral agents; that he ſets life and death before us, and leaves us to make our own choice, and to fare accordingly: That, as our eternal ſtate depends on what uſe we make of our agency, millions will prove rebellious, and, therefore, miſs of ſalvation. But I query, if one ſoul can obtain ſalvation, on the principle of moral agency, why another cannot, as well? If it be granted he can, I aſk, again, why all men cannot, as well as any? If it be ſtill granted, I ſay, as I have before ſaid, that which can be done, may be done; therefore, the objection fails. But the objector will ſay, it renders univerſal ſalvation uncertain; I anſwer, no more than it renders univerſal damnation certain: All may be loſt forever, as well as one; therefore, my opponent's hopes are ſubject to the ſame ſhipwreck, to which

he would expose mine. I would further inquire; if God deals with man upon a system of moral agency, is it God's revealed will, that all men should be saved, agreeably to their agency? If it be granted that it is, I further inquire, whether God's will, in the moral agency of man, will be eternally frustrated? If not, no objection stands against universalism; but the proposition, on which my opponent endeavors to substantiate an objection, favors the doctrine, as far as it goes.

In my observations on the *liberty* of *will*, I have given some of my ideas concerning agency, as it is generally understood; but moral agency may be very differently understood by different persons. If, by moral agency, be meant an ability to love an object, or objects, which appears agreeable, I have no objection to make; but if it mean an ability to hate that which is agreeable and disagreeable, I contend no such agency exists, in any being within the compass of our knowledge. It is certainly reasonable to suppose, that all the agency possessed by man, was given him by his Maker; and that when God gave him this agency, it was for a certain purpose, which purpose must, finally, be every way answered, providing God is infinitely wise. And I cannot but think it incorrect, to suppose, that God ever gave any crea-

ture agency to perform what he never intended ſhould be done. Then, if any ſoul is made endleſsly miſerable, by its agency, it follows, that God gave that ſoul this agency, for that unhappy purpoſe; and if any are ſaved, by their agency, God gave them their agency, for that bleſſed end. If any wiſh to make a different uſe of agency, let them ſtate fairly, that God gave man an agency, intending man's eternal ſalvation thereby; but man makes a different uſe of his agency, from what God intended, whereby the gracious deſigns of Deity are forever loſt!

If my opponent will not fix his agency on ſome of the above noted principles as it reſpects the iſſue of the argument, I am ſure he can do nothing with it to any effect. If agency be ſtated on the principle of God's intending the creature's ſalvation, by it, and it be granted, that his will, in the affair, will be done, it is an acknowledgement of the doctrine for which I contend. But if it be ſtated, that, although God gave man his agency, for the glorious purpoſe of his endleſs felicity, yet his purpoſe may fail; could this ſtatement be proved true, it would not only refute univerſal ſalvation, but every thing elſe, as being a divine ſyſtem, on which we may, with any confidence, depend.

One of the objections, on which the enemies of univerſal holineſs and happineſs put much dependence, and which they frequently urge againſt the doctrine, is ſtated from the force of *unlimited words*, as they find a few of them in ſcripture applied to the miſery of the wicked. The force of this objection, I remove, by proving, that unlimited words are applied to things and events which are not ſtrictly eternal or endleſs; and ſurely, the candid reader will acknowledge this way of reaſoning is juſt, and by no means evaſive. I ſhall not labor this point largely, for it has been done faithfully by an abler author, whoſe works are among us. I will only introduce a few ſcriptures, and make ſome obſervations on them, for the benefit of thoſe of my readers who have not ſeen the maſterly works referred to. See Gen. xvii. 7, 8. "And I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations, for an *everlasting* covenant; to be a God unto thee, and thy ſeed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, the land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the land of Canaan for an *everlasting* poſſeſſion; and I will be their God." Verſe 13, "He that is born in thy houſe, and he that is bought with thy money, muſt needs be circumciſed; and my covenant ſhall be

in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." In the above passage, the land of Canaan is called an *everlasting* possession. Will my opponent contend the word *everlasting*, here means an endless duration? Will he contend, that Abraham now possesses the land wherein he was then a stranger, or that his seed do, or will, possess that land, as long as God exists? If not, then the objection is given up.

Again, the covenant of *circumcision in the flesh* is called an *everlasting* covenant. Will the objector contend, that the covenant of circumcision in the *flesh* is now in force, and that it will remain in force as long as God exists? It is evident, from scripture, that these ordinances and this covenant are removed, and succeeded by a *covenant* which is called a *better* one; see Heb. viii. 6, 7, 8. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *new covenant*, with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." Chap. ix. 10, the apostle argues, that the ordinances of the first covenant

were impoſed on the people until the time of reformation. Gen. xlviii. 3, 4. "And Jacob ſaid unto Joſeph, God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and bleſſed me; and ſaid unto me, behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy ſeed after thee, for an *everlasting* poſſeſſion." And he further ſaid, in the bleſſing of Joſeph, "The bleſſings of thy father have prevailed above the bleſſings of my progenitors unto the utmoſt bounds of the everlaſting hills." Exod. xl. 15, "And thou ſhall anoint them (Aaron's ſons) as thou anointed their father, that they may miniſter unto me in the Prieſt's office; for their anointing ſhall *surely* be an *everlasting* prieſthood throughout their generations." Lev. xvi. 35, "And this ſhall be an *everlasting* ſtatute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Iſrael, for all their ſins once a year; and he did as the Lord commanded Moſes." The reader may learn the aboliſhment of the prieſthood that is here called an *everlasting* prieſthood, from Heb. vii. 11, 12. "If, therefore, perfection were by the Levitical prieſthood, (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another prieſt ſhould riſe after the order of Melchiſedec and not be called after

the order of Aaron ? For the prieſthood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a change alſo of the law." Jonah ii. 6. "I went down to the bottom of the mountain; the earth with her bars were above me *forever:* yet haſt thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God." Many more paſſages might be quoted, to clear this point of argument, if more were neceſſary; but depending ſome, as I ought to, on the candor of my reader, I forbear to be tedious.

In the next place, I will take notice of a number of ſcriptures in connexion, all of which have been erroneouſly applied to the future and endleſs miſery of mankind. See Mal. iv. 1, "For behold, the day cometh that ſhall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, ſhall be ſtubble, and the day that cometh ſhall burn them up, ſaith the Lord of hoſts, that it ſhall leave them neither root nor branch." Matt. iii. 10, "And now alſo, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and caſt into the fire." Verſe 12, "Whoſe fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire." Chap. v. 29, 30, "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out

and caſt it from thee : for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy members would periſh, and not that thy whole body ſhould be caſt into hell." Chap. vii. 13, 14, "Enter in at the ſtrait gate ; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to deſtruction, and many there be that go in thereat ; becauſe ſtrait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth to life, and few there be that find it." Chap, xiii. 30, "Let both grow together until the time of harveſt ; and in time of harveſt, I will ſay unto the reapers, gather ye together, firſt the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them ; but gather the wheat into my barn." The whole of the 25th, which is too lengthy to be written at large. The laſt paragraph of Luke xvi. Theſs. i. 7, 8, 9, "And to you who are troubled, reſt with us ; when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming *fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ; who ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." There are a number more ſcriptures of the like nature of the above quoted, to which I ſhould be glad to attend, were it not for ſwelling this work too large. I will, however, after I have an-

ſwered theſe in their order, take into conſideration ſome others of a different kind. Thoſe which I have quoted, moſtly reſpect that diſpenſation which is repreſented by fire, which to illuſtrate more eaſily to the reader's underſtanding, I will firſt produce a paſſage from St Paul's 1ſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians iii. 15, which I will call my *key* text, "If any man's work ſhall be burnt, he ſhall ſuffer loſs, but he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire." By my *key*, I learn, that the fire which cauſes the wicked to *ſuffer*, has the power of *ſalvation* even for the ſufferers. So in all the paſſages recited, where *fire* is mentioned, it is evident the ſame fire is intended. "For behold the day cometh that ſhall burn as an oven." In this ſame chapter, this day is called the great and dreadful day of the *Lord*. who promiſed to ſend Elijah the prophet before that day come, whoſe buſineſs ſhould be to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, leſt the Lord ſhould ſmite the earth with a curſe.

I inquire, firſt, concerning the coming of this prophet, in order to fix on a time for the commencement of this day of the Lord. That Elijah and Elias are the ſame, in ſcripture, no doubt will be entertained. Then turn to Matthew xvii. 12,

13, "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed; likewise, shall also the Son of Man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the baptist." By this scripture, it appears, that the promise of the coming of Elijah the prophet, was fulfilled by the coming of John the baptist, who came in the Spirit and power of Elias; which shows, very clearly, that the gospel day, or coming of Messiah was the day that should *burn* as an *oven*. The burning of an oven, is used here as a metaphor to represent the power of gospel light and love in the moral system. In the chapter preceding our text, Christ is prophecied of, as follows; see verse 1, and so on. Observe the forerunner is first spoken of, and then Christ himself, "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me;" thus far John the baptist is intended. "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a *refiner's fire* and like a fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver;

and he shall purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." The purpose intended by the fire of this day of the Lord is made very evident, by the above quotation, which, with my *key*, will much assist us in understanding the metaphor before us. First, how does an oven burn? Answer, so as to consume the combustibles which are in it, by which the oven is prepared for the Master's use, being perfectly cleansed, and of right temperature to receive whatever the baker pleases to put into it. By this fire, the sons of Levi were to be cleansed, so as to offer an offering in righteousness; & by this fire, the hay, wood and stubble, are burned; but the possessor of them, though he *suffer loss*, yet is saved by it. Here we see, in room of the sinner's endless misery, his purification as a pre-requisition for endless bliss and happiness. My opponent may urge, that the text says, the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch; which hath respect to the *sinner*, and not to his *sins*. Be it so: But will the passage afford my opponent's inference, which is the endless duration of the sinner's misery? By no

means; for that which is burnt up, *root* and *branch*, does no longer abide. To say, of a tree, that it was burnt up, *root* and *branch*, would forbid the idea of its enduring the *fire always*. The total *annihilation* of the wicked, is a thousand times more literally proved, than his endless misery; and I may add, with propriety, that the very words which my opponent urges in support of endless misery, are sufficient proof against it. I argue, that this particular part of the text alludes to the total destruction of the sinner, in respect to the nature of the earthly Adam: of which, neither *root* nor *branch* will be left. This I conceive to be in reality what the text means; and I am perfectly willing to rest the correctness of my ideas on the experience of any vital lover of the religion of Christ. Call to mind, what a *crackling* of *thorns*, what a *breaking up* of the *nether parts* of thy *soul*, what a *consumption seized every part*, and what a *sinking* to *nothing*, when the *word* of *God*, the *spirit* of the *law*, which is *sharper* than any two edged sword, *pierced* to the *dividing* of thy *soul* and *spirit*, *joints* and *marrow*, & *plainly discerned* the *thoughts* and *intents* of thy *heart*, until you found yourself on the rock of ages. By this method of understanding the scriptures, we understand them experimentally.

Further, obſerve what is ſaid to thoſe who fear the Lord, in the Chapter where our text lies, "But unto you who fear my name ſhall the Son of righteouſneſs ariſe, with healing in his wings, and ye ſhall go forth and grow up as calves of the ſtall, and ye ſhall tread down the wicked, for they ſhall be as aſhes under the ſoles of your feet." Who are they, who truly fear the name of the Lord? Thoſe, and thoſe only, who have paſſed the *fire*, as above deſcribed; they receive healing from the Son of righteouſneſs, even from his *wings*, which are the *types* and *allegories* of the law, by which, the *word*, or *logos*, is brought to our underſtandings. Such grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But who are the wicked, which they are to tread down as aſhes under their feet? Their neighbors? Yes, according to the conduct of apoſtatized chriſtians who deſpiſe and perſecute all who differ from their ſuperſtitions: but according to truth, the wicked are their bodily, or creaturely natures and appetites. However hard it may ſeem to the reader, I ſay, the real chriſtian lives above himſelf, and views his carnal appetites contemptible as aſhes.

We paſs to Matthew iii. 10, "And now alſo, the ax is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore, every tree which

bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and caſt into the fire." In order to ſee that the fire into which the trees are caſt, when hewn down, is the ſame as that of which we have already ſpoken, obſerve verſe 11, "I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whoſe ſhoes I am not able to bear, he ſhall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost* and with *fire*." By this, we underſtand, that the fire, in our text, is that which accompanies the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and is that fire with which Chriſt baptizes. Verſe 12, "Whoſe fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with *unquenchable fire*." *Fire* is mentioned, in each of the three verſes quoted, and its uſe is plainly ſhown, which is to *burn* the *trees* which bring not forth good fruit, to *accompany* the *Holy Ghost* in *baptism*, and to *conſume* the *chaff* when the wheat is gathered into the garner.

Now let us look for the doctrine of endleſs miſery, and ſee if it can be proved by the text under conſideration. I will agree, that the *trees*, which do not bring forth *good fruit*, are wicked men; and my oppoſers muſt acknowledge, that they, and all the reſt of mankind, are of that

deſcription, as it is written, "there is none that doeth good, no not one." And who will pretend the phariſees, to whom John ſpake, whom he calls a generation ofvipers, were not wicked? And if caſting the trees into the fire mean caſting ſinners into remedileſs woe, I aſk, if the baptiſm of the *Holy Ghost* and of *fire* mean the ſame thing? None will allow it; but all believe it to be ſalutary to all thoſe who experience it. The reader will then obſerve, John told this generation of *vipers*, that he, who ſhould come after him ſhould *baptize them* with the *Holy Ghost*, and with *fire*. How could thoſe phariſees be made endleſsly miſerable, and yet be ſaved by the power of the *Holy Ghost*? If we examine the burning of the chaff, we ſhall find it to be by the ſame fire, and the conſequences the ſame.

The reader may deſire ſome more explanation of theſe paſſages; then learn, firſt the *axe*, which is laid at the *root* of the *trees*, is the *executive power* of the *law*; the root, that Adamic nature, in which we all ſtand naturally; the trees, every individual of mankind; being hewn down, is being ſlain by the law; being caſt into the *fire*, is being refined by the ſpirit of the law, whereby the ſoul is prepared for the kingdom of holineſs and

happineſs. All this muſt be done for the beſt of characters in the earthly nature. In the ſimilitude of the wheat and the chaff, we have a very natural repreſentation of man in two ſtates; for as man, in his natural ſtate, is encompaſſed with the imperfections of the earthly Adam, ſo he is repreſented by wheat, which, when growing in the field, is encompaſſed with chaff, which continues to confine it, until it comes to maturity, and a proceſs is introduced which makes the ſeparation. Here let me make ſome further uſe of the ſimilitude than juſt to anſwer my point of argument. Wheat, though concealed from vulgar eyes, by chaff, yet, by the experienced, in the raiſing of grain, is perfectly well known; and we do not condemn wheat and throw it away, becauſe nature has ſo ordered, that is encompaſſed with chaff while growing in the field. So man is not to be valued leſs by the wiſdom of God, on account of the imperfections of his earthly nature. And we may, with great propriety, argue, that, as chaff is neceſſary for the growth of wheat, until it comes to maturity; ſo are all the imperfections of man, viewed by divine wiſdom, until the creature comes to that experience, which was intended in a ſtate of imperfection. As the proceſs, that ſeparates wheat from chaff, would diſappoint the expecta-

tion of the husbandman, were it applied prematurely; so the *gospel*, by which men are prepared for the kingdom of God, must do its office in due time, or in the fullness of time. The state in which man is, prior to the knowledge of God and his heirship in him, is represented by wheat connected with chaff; and the state, unto which he is finally brought, by divine mercy, is represented by a *garner* which receives the wheat when it is separated from chaff. The unquenchable fire which consumes the chaff, is a significant figure of the power of gospel grace to remove all *excrescences* from our *hearts* and *consciences*, and to prepare us for the kingdom of immortal purity. What, but the *nature of God*, can be justly called *unquenchable fire?* If any other principle in the universe can justly bear that appellation, it must be *equal*, if not *superior*, to *God himself*. An apostle says, "our *God* is a *consuming fire;*" and I must consider it erroneous, to believe, that this fire is *quenchable*, or that there is more *unquenchable fires* than *one*. This *fire* of eternal *truth* will, undoubtedly, destroy every thing which is in opposition to its nature; but has no power to destroy its own nature or its offspring. Now, if after these observations, the candid reader can see the eternal misery of mankind proved from the

ſcriptures under conſideration, all I have to add, is, that he can ſee more than I can.

We come next to that paſſage, made much uſe of, againſt univerſal holineſs and happineſs, found in Matthew v. 29, 30. The force of my opponent's argument reſts on being "caſt into *hell*," connected with the like paſſage in St. Mark ix. where the ſubject is expoſed to be caſt into the *fire* that *never* ſhall be *quenched*.

Let us firſt enquire what conſtitutes *hell*. The word, *hell*, undoubtedly, has different meanings in ſcripture, ſometimes ſignifying the *grave*, and ſometimes a ſtate of great trouble of mind, in conſequence of conſciencious guilt. The hell, noted in our text, is of the latter ſignification, as no one will diſpute; but my query is, what conſtitutes this hell. I conceive it to be proved by the conjunction of contrary principles in the mind. All the vile appetites of man, were they gratified, without the leaſt reſtraint, could never produce this *hell*, without the reflections of divine truth, in the underſtanding. Though the body might be debilitated by it, and impregnated with corroſive diſorders, yet no diſturbance is felt in the mind, until a divine principle wakes up, like a light ſhining in a dark place. As when a traveller enters a dark cave for reſt, though poiſonous ſerpents abide there, yet

he may be undiſturbed, until the ſun riſes and diſcovers to him, by what he had been entertained! He is ſhocked, his blood runs cold, and he is in diſtreſs, until he makes his eſcape. It is evident that this traveller's trouble was produced by two circumſtances; firſt, the ſerpents being there; and ſecondly, the light's giving him the knowledge of it. This glorious light of heaven is not to be accuſed, for having tormented the traveller; and yet, had it not been for that, he might have felt no diſturbance. So it is with man, he might enter into all the vile abominations of a carnal mind; he might gorge his fleſhly appetite with every ſenſual pleaſure; he might indulge his feet in every by-path, his eyes in every fleſhly luſt, and his hands in blood, and feel no remorſe, were it not for this fire, which all the *floods* of *corruption* can never *quench*.

The next queſtion, to which I wiſh to call the attention of the reader, is, whether the ſalvation of the ſinner does not entirely depend on the force, power and unchangeable nature of this divine fire, which opens his eyes to ſee the poiſonous nature of carnal pleaſures & earthly mindedneſs? Could all the black waters of the carnal or old man, in the leaſt degree, quench the heat of this fire, down the ſinner

is loſt forever ; but his ſalvation is hoped for, if the fire is never quenched. Here, again, the reader will obſerve, that, on the very expreſſion, upon which my opponent builds his argument, I reſt mine; ſhewing its propriety, by applying my key text, " If any man's work be burnt, he ſhall ſuffer loſs ; but he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire." The man poſſeſſed of hay, wood and ſtubble, would not ſuffer the loſs of them, were it not for that fire, by which the day of the Lord is revealed ; neither could he be ſaved, with a goſpel ſalvation, did not this fire conſume thoſe vile combuſtibles.

My opponent may urge his argument, on another expreſſion, in connection with this ſcripture, viz " Where the worm dieth not." Should we be ever ſo critical, in inveſtigating theſe words, they would be found to favor the idea for which I contend. If, by the *worm*, is meant the *wicked*, which I am willing to grant, and which I know my oppoſer will contend for, what I need to add, is, that, all it proves, is, this *fire* is not *death* to the *ſinner*. All the moral death, to which men are expoſed, is *carnal mindedness ;* and all the moral life, of which they can be poſſeſſed, is contained in the ſpirit of divine animation, which, in the ſcripture under conſideration, is repreſented by *fire*, that

never can be quenched. I am as fully purſuaded, of this truth, as I am of any idea in all my ſtudy; and I believe my reader will be of my opinion, if he will obſerve what Chriſt has further ſaid concerning it, in the converſation where the text lies; ſee Mark, ix. 49, 50, "For every one ſhall be ſalted with *fire*, and every ſacrifice ſhall be ſalted with ſalt. Salt is good; but if the Salt have loſt its ſaltneſs, wherewith will ye ſeaſon it? Have *Salt* in yourſelves, and have peace one with another." All who obſerve attentively, will eaſily ſee, that the *fire*, with which every one is to be ſalted, is the ſame that never ſhall be quenched, and is that ſalt which Chriſt exhorts us to have in ourſelves, which is productive of peace. The reader will eaſily ſee the impropriety of ſuppoſing ſuch ſcriptures indicative of the endleſs miſery of mankind; and the propriety of underſtanding them conſonant with my key text, ſignifying the deſtruction of ſin, and the ſalvation of the ſinner.

We next take notice of Matthew vii. 13, 14. The argument againſt me, is reſted on theſe expreſſions, viz. "And many there be which go in thereat," "And few there be that find it." In order to detect this argument, as laconically as poſſible, I firſt aſk, do the words *few* and *many* mean the ſame number, when applied

to the ſame object of inquiry? I preſume, all will anſwer, no. I then aſk, is it proper, or juſt, to ſay, the word, *many*, in Iſaiah v. 3, 11, where it is written, "By his knowledge, ſhall my righteous ſervant juſtify *many*, for he ſhall bear their iniquities," means the ſame number, as the word *few*, in the text under conſideration? Again, Rev. vii. After an account is given of the hundred and forty and four thouſand, it is ſaid, verſe 9, "After this, I beheld, and lo, a *great multitude*, which no man could number, of *all nations*, and *kindreds*, and *people*, and *tongues*, ſtood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Will any one doubt the ſalvation of the *many*, ſpoken of by Iſaiah, or the great multitude, quoted from Revelation? If they do not, they can, with no propriety, contend that the *few*, ſpoken of by Chriſt, in the paſſage under examination, are all that will finally obtain ſalvation by him.

Let us now take notice of the text, in its true ſenſe. The way of life is, now, what it always was, and always will be, which is Chriſt, the heavenly man; and the way to deſtruction is what it always was, and always will be, which is the earthly Adam, or carnal or old man. Chriſt ſpake, in the then preſent tenſe, ſhowing

that the multitude were all travelling in earthly mindedneſs, which is death; and that thoſe, who had truly found him, of whom Moſes and the prophets did write, who walked in the Spirit, and not in the fleſh, were but *few*.

My opponent, ſeeing his objection, which reſted on the words *few* and *many*, anſwered, and the text rationally explained, aſide from his idea, will wiſh to infer an argument, from what I have acknowledged to oppoſe me. He will ſay, if the multitude, under the law, were not acquainted with the goſpel, they muſt be forever loſt from *holiness* and *happiness*, as they died in that ſtate of ignorance. I have already attended to this objection, but wiſh to write a few words more on the ſubject. The ſuppoſition, that the ſoul cannot be altered for the better, after the death of the body, will confound the ideas of many who believe it. You aſk one, who believes there is no alteration after death, whether he believes the ſaint to be as perfect while he lives in this world, as he will be hereafter? And he will ſay, no. Aſk him if he expects to be perfectly fitted for heaven and eternal glory, while he inhabits this vile body, and he will anſwer, no; and yet he holds there is no alteration after death. Why

the idea has become so general, that souls cannot be enlightened, and converted from sin to holiness, after the death of the body, is difficult for me to determine. If the soul continues a rational being, cannot the All-wise communicate knowledge to it *out* of the natural body, as well as he can *in* it? If the soul, after death, has a moral existence, it must be a subject of moral principles, and stand accountable to a moral law adapted to his moral capacity; and it must be as much the duty of souls, hereafter, to yield obedience to God, as it is while they are in the body; and to preclude the possibility of such obedience, would be a dishonor to such a law. To deny the existence of those moral principles, in the world to come, is denying the existence of rational happiness, or punishment. My opponent will say, if God has revealed to us, in the scriptures of truth, that he will not afford any privilege, after death, to those who do not become true converts to Christ, in this world, we have no right to say to the reverse, however much our reason may be put to confusion, I answer, that may be granted, without injury to my argument, as no such revelation has been made; when it is, it will be early enough to believe it.

The parable of the tares of the field, comes next under consideration. This

paſſage needs not to be quoted at large, as the reader has it perfectly in his mind. In order to do this ſubject juſtice, I will endeavor to ſtate the objection on the ground, upon which I believe my opponent would chuſe to reſt it; which is, the *tares* mean *wicked men* and *women* who are impenitent; and as the tares are to be burnt, it ſignifies the awful ſtate into which God will caſt the wicked, in the world to come. For the ſake of the argument, I will grant, for a moment, what the objector ſtates, and further inquire, if the righteous, or believers in Chriſt, are repreſented by wheat, and the wicked by *tares*, what is meant by the *field*, in which theſe two kinds of ſeed were ſown? It will not anſwer any one's mind, to ſay, that the field is the ſame as the ſeed ſown; then, what is it? Says my opponent, it is the earth, on which the righteous and the wicked live; be it ſo; then let us ſeek the conſequences. Of the tares, it is ſaid, he, that ſowed them, is the devil. According to this mode of reaſoning, God has produced ſome of the inhabitants of the earth, and the devil ſome; and all the wrong there is, in the affair, is a matter of treſpaſs. The devil has ſown ground that did not belong to him, as it appears by the text, that the field belonged to him who ſowed the good ſeed; and that he who

ſowed the tares occupied ground that did not belong to him. I do not ſee why the devil could not have created an earth, as eaſily as to create men and women; and then, he might have occupied his own territory unmoleſted! I do not wiſh to take too much advantage of an error, but I wiſh to make this matter ſo plain, that no reader may fail of ſeeing the merits of the query. I will, therefore, inquire further, what conſtitutes thoſe wicked, whom the devil placed on this earth? Have they ever deſerted the ſervice of Satan; and rebelling againſt their Maker, ſinfully yielded obedience to God? If they have faithfully ſerved their Creator, I can ſee no ſinfulneſs in them, and it would be bad argument, to ſay, that God would ſubject beings to his government whom he he did not make. The thoughts of ſuch conſequences wean the objector's mind from the premiſes which afford them, and other anſwers to the queſtions propoſed muſt be ſought for. What is meant by wheat? what, by tares? and what, by field, in which the wheat and tares were ſown? I think the anſwers muſt be as follow: The *wheat* means the ſame as is meant by *ſeed* ſpoken of in a former parable, the explanation of which introduces the one under examination. In the parable of the ſower, it is plain, that Chriſt

meant the gospel, or the doctrine of truth, by seed which he sowed; and by the various kinds of soil into which the seed fell, is meant the various circumstances, in a moral sense, of those to whom he preached the word of the kingdom. The truth then is plain; by wheat, is meant the true doctrine of Christ; the tares mean false doctrines which would be introduced by Antichrist; and the field is mankind, or the church. Christ undoubtedly meant to represent the christian apostacy, in this parable; in which state of the church, we find truth and error mixed, the gospel of life, and the doctrine of endless damnation, like wheat and tares in the same field. Christians have framed to themselves doctrinal creeds and modes of faith, and called them orthodox; they have bowed down to their images, & said, these are the Gods which brought us up out of the land of Egypt; they have endeavored, by fire and sword, to destroy heresy, in which they have been as unskilful as Christ represented in the parable; they were as likely to root up the wheat as the tares. But when those doctrines have brought forth their fruits, and it shall appear evident to all, that evil consequences have always attended those creeds formed by men, it will be easy for those, who are

wiſe in the goſpel, to gather thoſe tares, and *burn* them with that fire which conſumes the hay, wood and ſtubble; and to gather the true doctrine of goſpel promiſes into the garner, or church of Chriſt, no more to be mixed with tares, or falſehood.

What a pity it is, ſpeaking in reference to partial good and evil, that profeſſed miniſters of Chriſt ſhould ſo vehemently contend for the truth of doctrines which they themſelves acknowledge no being wiſhes true, but the devil and his ſubordinate wicked ſpirits. It is the general topic of the day, in this enlightened land, contended for in almoſt every pulpit, that ſome of God's rational dependent creatures muſt, of *neceſſity*, ſuffer in endleſs torments, with devils, to blaſpheme God forever, and never ceaſe from ſin, which, they, who believe and preach it, wiſh and daily pray, might be falſe. If falſe doctrines are intended, by tares, in this parable, and thoſe tares are to be deſtroyed, the conſequence muſt be ſalutary to mankind, for they will then know the truth, and the truth will make them free.

My opponent may urge his ideas of the parable of the tares are moſt conſonant to the explanation which Chriſt gave it, as it is there ſaid, the tares are the *children of the wicked one, &c.* I do not wiſh to

explain Chriſt's explanation ; but I believe the reader of the preſent day, would be as likely to miſunderſtand the explanation as the parable itſelf. I know Chriſt ſaid, the *good seed* are the *children* of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one. But I do not conceive, that, by *children* of the *kingdom*, in this parable, is meant the ſame as is meant by the ſame expreſſion in ſome other paſſages, inſtance one, ſee Matthew viii. 12, " But the *children* of the *kingdom* ſhall be caſt out into outer darkneſs," &c. ; no one will ſuppoſe, that the *children* of the *kingdom* in the above quotation, are the ſame with thoſe in the parable. Whatever is born of God, is a child of God ; and this may be ſaid of a perſon who is born into the kingdom of truth and grace ; or of that true *faith* by which he is ſo born, this faith being a divine production. For proof, ſee 1 John iii. 9, " Whoſoever is born of God doth not commit ſin." Here, no doubt a human being may be intended ; again, ſee chap. v. 4, " For *whatsoever* is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*." In this paſſage, true faith is ſaid to be born of God, and therefore my idea that the truths of the goſpel ought to be conſidered the children of the kingdom, according to the

parable, may appear consistent. I am disposed, however, to condescend so much to my opponent, as to acknowledge, that the wicked are sometimes said to be the *children* of the devil, &c. see St. John viii. 44, "Ye are of your father the devil." See verse 37, "I know that ye be Abraham's seed." Again, verse 39, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." I am sure, my opponent would not wish to prove more from the above quotations than that those Jews were *virtually* the children of Abraham, but *characteristically* the children of the devil. Then, admitting wicked men are represented by tares in the parable, and this representation is a representation of character, then the destruction of the tares signifies a *destruction* of *evil* character, which argument, though I do not want, is forced upon me to my advantage in the query.

The whole of the 25th chapter of Matthew, which contains the parable of the virgins, of the talents, and of the sheep and goats, is considered directly against the universal holiness and happiness of mankind. In the parable of the virgins, those were called foolish who took no oil in their vessels with their lamps, who were not ready to go into the marriage when the bridegroom came, but after-

wards knocked, saying, *Lord, Lord* open unto us, but were answered by Christ, "Verily I say unto you I know you not."

Those foolish virgins, says my opposer, represent those who are to be rejected at last, who will be miserable as long as God exists. On supposition that was the case, how can it be proved? Is there any thing in this scripture, that positively testifies that to be the case? My opponent will not contend there is, but only a parabolical allusion to the eternal destruction of the wicked, not positive testimony of it. But I wish to say, it is my opinion, that a doctrine ought to be proved by plain testimony, before we can be authorised to apply allegories and parables to it. Supposing I was unable to give any rational account of the meaning of this parable, would it give my opponent any advantage? Would it not rest with him to prove that his application of the parable is just, before he ought to bring it as an objection against the doctrine for which I argue? If the reader can find any thing in the parable which necessarily means endless misery, all I can say, is, he has made a discovery which I have not. But as I do not judge myself altogether ignorant of the true meaning of this parable, I will trouble the reader with a few inquiries explanatory of the passage. "Then shall

the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When? Is that time yet future? If it be, nothing is to be underſtood by the connexion of the diſcourſe. The word, *then*, has reference to a deſignated time, which we find in the 24th chap. and 34th verſe, "Verily I ſay unto you, this generation ſhall not paſs, till all theſe things ſhall be fulfilled." According to the words of Chriſt, who undoubtedly knew his own meaning better than we do, all things propheſied of, in the 24th chap. were fulfilled in that generation. Look back to the 23d chap. and 36th verſe, "Verily I ſay unto you, all theſe things ſhall come upon this generation." The time of that generation was the time of the fulfilment of all things ſpoken of in the 24th and 25th chapters; there is no other time deſignated for the word *then*, to apply to. I muſt inquire, what kingdom of heaven this is, which is repreſented by ten virgins, five of which are wiſe and five are fooliſh. One half of the kingdom o heaven, according to this parable, is compoſed of fooliſh virgins! This cannot mean the kingdom of eternal righteouſneſs, where wiſdom in her purity dwells.

The foregoing obſervations may prepare the mind for the following conciſe explanation. The Jews, or God's cove-

nant people, under the legal dispensation, are here represented by ten virgins. The close of the law dispensation, and the introduction of the gospel, is the time alluded to, in the parable. The lamps, signify the rites, and ordinances of the Levitical priesthood, which contained the light of the expected Messiah. The oil, which the wise had in their vessels, with their lamps, was the knowledge of what those figures represented. The foolish not looking from these rites to the antitype, but expecting salvation by the letter, were called foolish. John was the friend of the bridegroom, and was the voice of one, crying, behold, the bridegroom cometh; go, ye, out to meet him. Midnight represents the state of gross darkness which then covered the people.

When Christ entered the *sanctum sanctorum*, by his resurrection, and those whom he had chosen were ready, the door of the law was forever closed. The situation of the Jews, ever since, is represented, by virgins without knocking for entrance, &c.

The reader will undoubtedly acknowledge the propriety of the above short explanation, but will endeavor to make some efforts against me, with those blinded Jews. The idea, that the Jews were so rejected by Christ, that they would never

obtain mercy by him, perhaps is not warrantable from the ſcriptures. The reverſe appears evident, from the teſtimony of Chriſt to them, ſee Matthew xxiii, 37, 38, 39, "O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, thou that killeſt the prophets, and ſtoneſt them that are ſent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your houſe is left unto you deſolate; for I ſay unto you, ye ſhall not ſee me henceforth, till ye ſhall *ſay*, *blessed* is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The fore part of the above is frequently recited, to prove the endleſs rejection of the Jews, but the latter clauſe fully refutes ſuch a ſentiment. For, tho' Chriſt ſpake of the deſolate ſtate in which the Jews would be, for a ſeaſon; yet, he points to a time when they ſhould ſee him, and call him bleſſed. If my opponent can reconcile this glorious prophecy with the endleſs excluſion of thoſe Jews, I will not contend againſt him any more.

We ſhall find it no leſs difficult, to ſupport the doctrine of endleſs miſery, by the parable of the talents, than by the parable of the virgins. The words which cloſe this parable are what my opponent would found his objection upon, ſee verſe 30, "And caſt ye the unprofitable ſervant in-

to outer darkneſs, there ſhall be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth." That, ſays my oppoſer, means endleſs miſery; but how am I to know it does? Or how does he know it? Does the text neceſſarily carry that meaning? No, it does not. The Pſalmiſt ſays, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." But if the night of weeping be endleſs, when will the morning of joy come? The prophet Iſaiah ſays, that God ſhall wipe tears from *all* faces; but if Chriſt meant, in this parable, that ſome of the human race ſhould weep to an endleſs eternity, he was of a different opinion from the prophet. Can we be juſtified, in explaining the ſcriptures into a poſitive contradiction? Muſt tradition cauſe the whole bible to bow down, on hearing all kinds of muſic, to the images which, by the craft of men, have been ſet up? Muſt the vain ſuppoſitions of men ſupercede the divine oracle? Muſt the divine light of the plain teſtimony of the ſpirit of prophecy become *dim* before the moon ſhine of tradition? Without explaining this parable particularly, which I have done in my Notes, I diſmiſs it, obſerving, it repreſents the ſame to which I applied the former.

The parable of the ſheep and goats, which concludes the 25th of Matthew, has

been made great uſe of, to oppoſe univerſal holineſs and happineſs. and to ſupport the doctrine of *endleſs* miſery. Thoſe arguments have been reſted on the laſt words of the chapter, which read thus, "And theſe ſhall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*. The word, *everlasting*, being applied to the miſery of the wicked, it is contended that it muſt be endleſs. But I have ſufficiently proved, that the word, *everlasting*, is frequently applied to events which are not ſtrictly *eternal*; therefore, to contend for endleſs miſery, from the force of that word, is begging ground which ought to have been given up before now.

The adverſaries of the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs have contended, with great ſeeming aſſurance, that if the word, *everlasting*, which is here applied to the puniſhment of the wicked, does not mean an endleſs duration, the word, *eternal*, uſed in the text, may not, as they both come from the ſame root; and conſequently, they have argued that the happineſs of the righteous may come to an end, if the miſery of the wicked does. In anſwer to ſomuch ingenuity and argument, I ſay, the word, *eternal*, is not applied to the *duration* of happineſs, but to the nature of that life which is brought

to light through the gospel; and as that life is of the nature of the unchangeable deity, we justly believe it to be endless; but I grant the *word*, *eternal*, being applied to it, does not prove it to be so. Neither do I suppose it *certain*, that those, who entered into this life, at that time, continued invariably in the spirit of it. I believe a person may, by the grace of God, enter into the enjoyments of this eternal life, at one time, and at another, by reason of his folly, may lose those enjoyments. Now, having shown the weakness of what the pretended critic has argued, I will give a few leading features of the parable; not taking up time to be particular, for reasons already given.

The time of Christ's coming in his glory, was the day of pentecost. His holy angels, with whom he came, were his chosen apostles. His glory, is the gospel of eternal life. Sheep and goats, signify believers and unbelievers. *Right* hand and *left* mean *gospel* and *law*. The believer stands in the gospel of life: The unbeliever is condemned already, & the wrath of God, in the letter of the law, abideth upon him. For proof, that Christ's coming was in that generation. See Matthew xvi. 27, 28, "For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man ac-

cording to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom," If Christ is to be understood as he said, if his words explain his meaning, it is clear, that his coming in his glory, with his angels, to reward men, according to their works, was some time in the life-time of those to whom he spake. If this be true, which my opponent with his eyes open, will not dispute, then no objection can be stated, from this parable, against the final holiness and happiness of all men. Should any say, (as many have said) that they see no parable in the last paragraph of the 25th of St. Matthew, I will only add, if there be no parable in it, it only respects two kinds of animals, called sheep and goats, and we have nothing to do with it. We come to the last paragraph in the 16th of St. Luke, of which, much use has been made against the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness; and is said to contain a very literal account of the death of the rich man, and of his being in hell, after death; and the death of the poor man, and his future happiness. It is contended, by the most of those who oppose the doctrine which I endeavor to vindicate, that this paragraph ought to be taken and understood in its most literal sense, and

that Chriſt did not intend it as a parable. Though I am very far from believing this paragraph to be a literal account, yet, I will admit it, for the better accommodating of the argument. For if I do not, but only give my opinion on the paſſage, my opponent will contend, that the objection is not anſwered, as he reſts it on the literality of the paſſage. Admitting the account juſt as literal as my oppoſer views it, is it poſſible for him to ſubſtantiate an objection againſt me, from it? I think not; for were it poſſible to prove, that an individual, who died in the days of Noah, had continued, from that time until now, in a ſtate of miſery, it would have no force to prove, that ſuch individual would be miſerable a ſingle year longer, much leſs, to prove he would be endleſsly ſo. Further, could it be proved, that a perſon, who recently died, would be in the worſt of torments, for a *million* of years to come, it would fall infinitely ſhort of proving that he would ſuffer *endleſsly*. If the ſuffering of a rational being, for a time, proves, that this being muſt be *endleſsly* miſerable, the proof ſtands againſt the whole family of Adam, not excepting Jeſus himſelf. If my opponent be under the neceſſity of giving me the argument, in this particular, which I know he muſt,

then, what evidence has he left, in the ſcripture under conſideration, to prove *endleſs* miſery? If it be urged againſt me, that the *gulf*, between Abraham and the rich man, was *impaſſable*, it proves nothing with regard to its duration. Let us now examine the paſſage a little, taking notice of the common ideas of it. It is ſaid, that the rich man lifted up his eyes in *hell*. Now it is believed and argued, that ſouls, in hell, are as deſtitute of any principle of goodneſs, as the devil in which people believe; that they are fully engaged in the devil's ſervice, and oppoſed to any thing and all things which are favorable to the kingdom of the Savior. This being the caſe, how is it that we have ſuch an account of the prayer which the rich man made to his father Abraham, in favor of his five brethren? He ſeems to be anxious for their welfare, and deſires that they might not come into ſuch a place of torment as he was in. How would ſuch a prayer pleaſe Belzebub, the prince of devils? Did I believe in ſuch a being, according to the general idea which people have of him, I ſhould ſuppoſe he would be very much alarmed, on hearing ſuch benevolent prayers made in his dark dominions! The prayer ſeems to favor the plan of goſpel grace, more than the vile purpoſes of Satan, though it did not ſeem

to dictate the matter exactly according to the divine purpose. It is generally believed that the devil is desirous of getting as many as possible into misery; if so, and the rich man desired that his brethren might not come into that place of torment, let his reasons be what they might, it is evident that his desires were opposed to the devil's. "A kingdom, divided against itself, cannot stand." Again, it is argued, by some, that those who are in heaven will rejoice, in consequence of the misery of those whom they see in torment, as the justice of God will, by their torments, be made to appear more glorious than it otherwise could, which, by the way, answers the most fervent desires of Satan. This being granted, should those, who are in heaven, on seeing those in hell, who, in this world, were their nearest connexions, feel the smallest regret, much more, desire to grant them assistance, it would be a complete violation of that justice which confined them there. But in our text, it is shown, that those, who are in Abraham's bosom are desirous of going to the rich man, and their object is plainly seen, that it is to relieve him from his torments, see verse 26, "So that *those* who *would pass* from *hence* to *you* cannot." It is very evident, that those, who were in Abraham's bosom, were desirous of assisting

the rich man; and, according to the common idea, it muſt have been deemed a rebellion againſt the will and juſtice of God, in conſequence of which, if the devil deſerved to be caſt out of heaven, for his diſobedience, theſe undoubtedly deſerve the ſame condemnation! If we look impartially into theſe things, it is eaſy to ſee, that ſomething wrong has been entertained in the common idea. By a little attention to the introduction of this paragraph, the reader may eaſily ſee the whole was intended as a ſimilitude, to ſhow the *adultery* which the high prieſt would commit, in rejecting the goſpel, and endeavoring to obtain juſtification, by attending to the law in the letter, the ſituation of that part of Iſrael that was broken off through unbelief, which is repreſented by five fooliſh virgins in the 25th of Matthew; the converſion of the gentiles to chriſtianity, and their reception into Abraham's *faith*, &c.

We paſs to take notice of 2d Theſs. i, 7, 8, 9. My opponent depends on the words, "everlaſting deſtruction," on which to found his argument againſt the ſalvation of all men; but I have before proved, that the word, *everlasting*, does not neceſſarily mean an endleſs duration, my opponent would fail in his argument, even if he could ſhow, that the word, *ev-*

erlasting, in the text, was applied to the duration of ſuffering; but this he cannot do; for the word, *everlasting*, is not applied to the *duration* of *punishment*, but to the deſtruction with which the ſinner is puniſhed. That which is deſtroyed, I grant, is endlessly deſtroyed. But here I call in my key text, to ſhow, that it is the hay, wood and ſtubble, which are to be deſtroyed. This will appear evident, if we obſerve the nature of the fire mentioned in our text. "And to you who are troubled, reſt with us, when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be *revealed* from *heaven*, with his mighty angels *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance," &c. This fire is that *in* which is *Christ* revealed, & it comes from heaven Is not this the fire with which he baptizes? Is not the fire revealed, to deſtroy the hay, the wood, and the ſtubble? Undoubtedly; and is the endleſs miſery of the ſinner to be proved, from the action of that divine fire which alone is able to effect his ſalvation? But the objector ſays, the text reads for itſelf, "Who ſhall be *punished* with *everlasting* deſtruction, *from* the preſence of the Lord, and *from* the glory of his power;" and if the ſinner is puniſhed *from* the preſence of the Lord, he cannot be bleſſed *in* it, where there are joys forever more. Anſwer, there is not a place in the univerſe which is *out* of the

preſence of an *omnipreſent* God; therefore, to put a ſinner from the preſence of the Lord he muſt be put out of the univerſe. But what means the text? ſays the reader; anſwer, that divine light and heat, which deſtroys moral darkneſs, and purges man from all ſin is *from* the preſence of the Lord as a production of the divine preſence, as it is written concerning the man of ſin, whom the Lord ſhall conſume with the breath of his mouth, and deſtroy with the brightneſs of his coming. If God were not able to puniſh the ſinner, in the manner deſcribed in the text, I ſhould deſpair of ſalvation; but bleſſed be that divine ſpirit of light and love; it truly takes ſuch vengeance on the ſinner as is worthy of a God. It makes him hate ſin, brings down the high mountains of his pride, takes away the fig-leaf garment, and clothes the man in his right mind.

There is a paſſage in the 12th of Matthew, the 31ſt and 32d verſes, which has been contended for as an unanſwerable objection to univerſal ſalvation. The text reads thus, "Wherefore I ſay unto you, all manner of ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto men; but the blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven unto men. And whoſoever ſpeaketh a word againſt the Son of man, it ſhall be forgiven him; but whoſoever ſpeaketh a-

gainſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him neither in this world, nor in the world to come. The common idea, of *this world and the world to come*, is the preſent life of man on earth, and that ſtate in which man exiſts hereafter. Could it be proved, that this was the right meaning of the word, *world*, there would be ſomething more in the text than I can now ſee. Some, who have ably defended the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation, have admitted the common idea of this paſſage, ſo far as it goes to prove future miſery, yet, have abundantly proved, that it would come to an end: But if the word, *world*, has the ſignification of *age*, or *diſpenſation*, as will not be diſputed, it will be impoſſible to prove, that any thing, beyond what may be experienced by men, in this mortal ſtate, was intended, in this text. We are informed, that Chriſt came once in the *end* of the *world*, to put away ſin, by the ſacrifice of himſelf. The *world*, of which Chriſt came in the *end*, was undoubtedly the *diſpenſation* of the legal prieſthood; according to which idea, the *world*, which was then to come, is the diſpenſation of goſpel light which roſe on the Gentile world, for the purpoſe of bringing them to the knowledge and worſhip of the true God; which diſpenſation ends with the converſion of the fullneſs of the

Gentiles, and will be ſucceeded by that in which Iſrael will be viſited by the ſpirit of their Meſſiah, and ſhall ſay, Bleſſed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.

What I have written on this ſubject will ſhow the reader the propriety of ſuppoſing, that the *ſin*, which the phariſees committed, in blaſpheming the Holy Spirit, by which Chriſt wrought miracles, has been viſited upon their deſcendants even to this day, and will continue upon them, until the fullneſs of the Gentiles be come in. But I ſee no need of carrying the meaning of theſe words to an endleſs eternity, or even beyond the experience of man in this natural life. Therefore, admitting the doctrine of future puniſhment true, I cannot ſee it proved, from theſe words.

Could it be proved, that eternal, or endleſs miſery was a natural production of the divine nature, there being an unchangeable principle to ſupport ſuch miſery, the argument, on my part, muſt be given up. If ſin is, in a moral ſenſe, the cauſe of miſery, ſhould ſin ever be brought to an end, its conſequences, which are miſery, would alſo come to an end. If my opponent can tell me how Jeſus will *finish ſin*, and make an *end* of tranſgreſſion, and yet ſin and tranſgreſſion continue as long as God exiſts, he will puzzle me more than all his objections have been able to do.

Having anſwered, as I hope, to the reader's ſatisfaction, ſome of the moſt important objections againſt God's univerſal goodneſs to his creatures, I ſhall now turn on the other hand, and give the reader ſome of my evidences for believing in the ſo much deſpiſed doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs. Firſt, I reaſon from the nature of divine goodneſs, in which all pretend to believe, and which none dare, in a direct ſenſe, to deny, that God could not, conſiſtent with himſelf, create a being that would experience more *misery* than *happiness*. Secondly, if God is infinitely good, his goodneſs is commenſurate with his power, and knowledge; then, all beings, whom his power produced, are the objects of his goodneſs; and to prove, that any being was deſtitute of it, would prove, that Deity's knowledge did not comprehend ſuch being. Thirdly, there is as much propriety, in ſaying, that God is *infinite* in *power*, but that he did not create *all* things; as there is, in ſaying, though God is infinite in goodneſs, yet, part of his creatures will ever be the partakers of it. It might as well be ſaid, that God is infinite in knowledge, and yet ignorant of the moſt part of events which are daily and hourly taking place, as to ſay, that he is infinitely good,

and yet only a few of his creatures were designed for happiness. Fourthly, if the Almighty, as we believe him to be, did not possess power sufficient to make all his creatures happy, it was not an act of goodness in him to create them. If he has that power, but possesses no will for it, it makes a bad matter as much worse as is possible. I then reduce my opponent to the necessity of telling me, if those, whom he believes will be endlessly lost, are those whom God *could* save, and *would* not, or those whom he *would* save, and *could* not! If it be granted, that God has both power and will to save all men, it is granting all I want, for a foundation of my faith.

I would further argue, that, as man is constituted to enjoy happiness, on moral principles, (to the knowledge of which principles we come by degrees) it is as reasonable to believe, that all men were intended to obtain a consummate knowledge of the moral principles of their nature, as that any of Adam's race were. There is not an individual of the whole family of man, who is perfectly satisfied with those enjoyments which earth and time afford him; the soul is constituted for nobler pleasures, which, to me, is an evidence that God has provided, for all men, some better things than can be found in earthly enjoyments, where we find but

little except vanity and disappointment. There is an immortal desire, in every soul, for future existence and happiness: For the truth of this assertion, I appeal to the consciences of my readers. Why should the Almighty implant this desire in us, if he never intended to satisfy it? Supposing a mother has the power of modifying the desires and appetite of her child, would she cause it to want that which she could not get for it? Would she take pleasure in seeing her child pine for fruits which did not grow in the country where she lived, and which she could not get? Or, would she prefer the anguish of the child, to its happiness, when it was in her power to grant all it wanted? If such a mother were to be found, who would call her a godly woman? Could her child, thus tormented, rise up and call her blessed? No, surely, it could not.

I further argue, that, all wise, good, and exemplary men, wish for the truth of the doctrine for which I contend; they earnestly pray for the salvation of all men, and do all in their power, by the grace of God, to dissuade men from sin, to the obedience of the gospel; they enlist willingly into the service of virtue, to endeavor to win proselytes to holiness; their object is the destruction of sin, and the advancement of righteousness; and they

believe, and I think juſtly, that God will bleſs their labors.

None, but wicked men, would wiſh for the endleſs duration of ſin; were it left to the carnal mind, it would wiſh for nothing but the privilege of drinking in iniquity forever. But thoſe, who truly love God and holineſs, deſire, night and day, to overcome the vile propenſities of their own deceitful hearts, and pray for the reconciliation of others to *holiness* and *happiness*. Now, why ſhould we ſuppoſe that God is more of the mind of the wicked, than of the righteous? If it is God's ſpirit in us, which cauſes us to pray for the deſtruction of ſin, is it reaſonable, to ſay, that this ſame ſpirit has determined that ſin ſhould always exiſt? Are we not right, in judging of the nature and character of God, from the dictates of his ſpirit in us? If ſo, does this ſpirit teach us the neceſſity of endleſs tranſgreſſion and miſery? I wiſh the reader to keep in mind, that I hold ſin and miſery inſeparably connected, and holineſs and happineſs ſo, likewiſe.

I further argue, if any of the human race are endleſsly miſerable, the whole muſt be, providing they all know it; for, reaſoning from that ſpirit of benevolence which is neceſſary to a conformity to the principles of holineſs, I prove it impoſſi-

ble for a well difpofed man to fee another in mifery, without bearing a very fenfible proportion of fuch mifery. If it be argued, that this idea is wrong, and that the fpirit which dictates it, is of the evil one; I fay, in anfwer, all good men in the world feel it to be a truth; and no man ever exhibited more of it than the Savior of the world. Man is conftituted with powers of fympathy; and while thefe principles laft, he cannot enjoy *complete* happinefs, and fee one of his fellow creatures in torment. I miftruft, fome one will fay, then *Chrift* is not completely happy, nor the faints who have gone before us. I have no objection to the obfervation; but think I fee a divine beauty in the idea. I will query a little, on the fubject. It is generally believed, that Chrift exifted, before he was born in Bethlehem; and it is evident, from the fcriptures, that he did.—But I would inquire, What was his fituation? Was it a ftate of *complete happinefs?* I think likely this queftion will generally be anfwered in the affirmative. Then I further afk, had he no defire for the falvation of finners, before he came into our world? Here the queftion *muft* be anfwered in the affirmative, let the other queftion be anfwered as it may; for, if that were not the cafe, why did he come

for the expreſs purpoſe of ſaving them? If he willed and intended the ſalvation of mankind, and alſo determined to encounter all the ſufferings that were finally laid upon him, in favor of ſo worthy an object, it is evident his happineſs was not complete; neither do I believe it will be, until he ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and be ſatisfied.

If any one ſhould be ſo particular as to query, aſking, if the Almighty himſelf is not deſirous of the ſalvation of ſinners; and if ſo, how can his happineſs be complete? I anſwer, a being, to whom events do not take place in ſucceſſion, nor time paſs away, with whom, an eternity is a preſent now, whoſe knowledge is intuitive, and who can neither hope, nor anticipate, can neither increaſe, nor decreaſe in happineſs. But when we ſpeak of *God*, abſtractedly, our words ought to be few, and choſen.

I have, I think, ſufficiently proved, in this work, that Jeſus Chriſt is *a created* dependant being, and that he ſtands at the head of the creation of man, &c. If I am right, in that idea, I think I may reaſonably argue, that he is a being to whom events take place in ſucceſſion, who hopes and anticipates, and who, for the joy ſet before him, endured the croſs, and deſpiſed the ſhame. Therefore, until the great

work of his miſſion is completed, I cannot conceive that his happineſs will be *complete*. If it be argued, that Chriſt, when on the croſs, ſaid it was finiſhed, and that, in a moral ſenſe, he felt no more pain for ſinners, I have a right to object, for I do not know what warrant the ſcripture gives, for believing *all* this argument. That the ſufferings of Chriſt, as to anſwer the type of a ſin-offering, were then ended, is a reaſonable idea; but to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt was then diſpoſſeſſed of that principle which cauſed him to feel for the woe of mankind, does not appear reaſonable. I have no idea, that the glorious Captain of our ſalvation now ſuffers, as he did, when he ſaid, "*My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?*" But I believe, that he, whoſe ſoul travailed for the redemption of man, now increaſes in joy, as the work of reconciliation is going on, to the deſtruction of ſin, and the converſion of ſinners. He has told us, that there is more joy, in the preſence of the angels, over *one* ſinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine juſt perſons who need no repentance. I do not conceive, that one part of human nature can be made perfectly happy, while the reſt are in miſery. When St. Paul ſpake of thoſe who died in faith, not having obtained the promiſe, he ſays, "God having pro-

vided some better things for us, that they, without us, could not be made perfect.

Those, who are the most devout on earth, are the most desirous for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the deliverance of themselves and their fellow men, from sin and misery.—For the sake of a case, I will suppose a christian, to-day, is exercised with fervent desires for the reconciliation of sinners; at night, he dies. Do all those holy desires cease, at death? If they do not, but do continue, though the happiness of the soul be great, yet, it is, at least, capable of being enlarged, or increased, by the prosperity of the Redeemer's cause among men.

How the idea ever got place in the human mind, that, even fathers and mothers, in the world to come, would rejoice, to see their own offspring in endless flames and hopeless torments, I can hardly conceive; though the probability is, it was first invented, to shun, in theory, those difficulties not otherwise to be avoided. I wish to use this error as prudently as possible; but I wish to have it rightly understood, and judged of impartially. Will perfect reconciliation to God have this effect? I know it is contended, that it will; but what evidence have we of it? Was not Christ reconciled, or in a state of con-

formity to God's law? Did he manifeſt joy at the ſufferings of mankind? When he looked on Jeruſalem, that abominable city, and knew that its chiefs would be his murderers, when he ſpake of the dreadful calamities juſt ready to burſt on their devoted heads, how did he feel? Streams of ſorrow brake from the eye of innocence; in his grief, he ſpake of their deſtruction, but propheſies of their ſeeing him again, when they ſhould welcome him, ſaying, "*Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!*"

If perfect reconciliation to God will effect complete happineſs at the ſight of human miſery, the more we are reconciled to God, the more ſatisfaction we ſhould take in ſeeing our fellow creatures miſerable! Then, thoſe, who can look on men in diſtreſs, with the leaſt ſorrow, are the moſt reconciled to divine goodneſs; and thoſe, who feel the moſt ſorrow at the afflictions of their fellow men, are the moſt perverſe and wicked! Some may ſay, heaven is entirely different from this world and when we get there, we ſhall be totally changed from what we now are; therefore, it will not do to argue, what we ſhall be there, from what we ought to be here. Then the awful fact is, all we call goodneſs here, will be called badneſs there;

and that which we call badneſs here, will be goodneſs there!

If the effects of moral holineſs, in the world to come, ſhould be different from what they are here, I wiſh to be informed on what moral principle the change is made. If theſe things be ſo, the ſouls of the cruel need but little alteration, to prepare them for heaven, and that little laid out in making them what we ſhould call worſe. Such a heaven as this, does not, I hope exiſt in the univerſe. My opponent will urge his argument ſtill further, on this ſubject, and ſay, it is not the *miſery* of the wicked that affords ſo much pleaſure to thoſe who are in heaven, but their *joy is increaſed*, in conſequence of the *execution of juſtice*. This, however, is giving up what is contended for, viz. that every degree of miſery will create thouſands of degrees of happineſs, becauſe, could divine juſtice be as well underſtood, without this miſery, as with it, the miſery itſelf would do no good, I am willing to grant, that a good man will prefer the execution of juſtice, to his own private eaſe, or the *partial* happineſs of a criminal. But how would a judge appear who ſhould manifeſt joy and gladneſs, on pronouncing the ſentence of death upon one of his fellow men? Who would not turn from ſuch a court with diſguſt and deep abhorrence?

To call such a circumstance an instance in which men have an occasion to rejoice, is a violation of our senses. I will say, for myself, I neither expect, nor desire, perfect happiness, while I see my fellow men in misery; I had rather be possessed of that *sympathy* which causes me to feel for another, than to *enjoy* an *unsocial pleasure* in a *frosty heaven of misanthropy!* Is it possible, that we should be *completely happy*, and see those in *misery* whom we *love?* No one will say we can. Are we not commanded to love our enemies? Can we be truly happy, and not love them? Surely we cannot; then how can we be completely happy, and see them miserable? A parent may be persuaded to attend his child, while, a surgeon performs an amputation, but with what acute feelings his heart is agitated! How eagerly would he inhale the pain, and make it his own, if it were possible? But there is something in all this, that is tolerable; he is in hopes of saving the life of his child; Were it not for his hopes, could he endure the sight? But what is all this, compared with a parent viewing his child in endless flames! O, parents, what a blessed circumstance it is, that when we are called to part with our children, on earth, we can mingle a little joy with the sorrow, in hoping they belong to the deathless family in

heaven! If the good desires, which are found in the christian heart, are ever to be satisfied, universal subjection to the government of Christ will surely take place: If virtue ever gains an universal victory over sin and vice, universal holiness and happiness will be the consequence. Man exists on such a principle, as renders him capable of improving in knowledge and happiness, which he obtains by experience; and it is very evident, that, as the wheels of time move, man is fast advancing, which favors the idea, that, at some period, known to *Deity*, the desired haven will be obtained, in the acquisition of that wisdom which is from above.

When we send our children to school, it is for the purpose of learning that of which they are ignorant; and it is by degrees, that those sciences are obtained, which constitute them learned. When a child first takes a quill in hand to write, he blunders, but does not blunder so as to imitate the copy, neither will two out of a thousand imitate each other.

Men begin their moral existence, in their separate capacity, in the same way; unacquainted with the skill of their divine preceptor, they err, from sacred rules, and differ from their fellow pupils. Jars and broils ensue, and sorrow and woe are the consequences. But as fast as they become

taught, they conform to the divine rules of their maſter, and learn that their happineſs conſiſts in being united. Happineſs is the greateſt object of all rational beings, and no one will follow any particular object any longer than he thinks it ſubſervient to his main one. The reaſon why men ſin, is, they think, and think erroneouſly, that they ſhall obtain more happineſs in ſo doing, than in following the dictates of truth. But it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the error will never be diſcovered? Will the ſinner never find his miſtake? O yes, ſays my oppoſer, to his eternal confuſion and endleſs miſery! But ſtop a moment; if he finds his miſtake, he will abandon the object; and when he ceaſes to ſin, he begins to reform, and approximate towards holineſs and happineſs. I have ſufficiently argued, that man cannot be miſerable, in conſequence of moral condemnation, any longer than he is, in a moral ſenſe, a ſinner. Then he muſt ſin, endleſsly, in order to be miſerable ſo long; which if ſo, he will never find his miſtake; he will never learn, that righteouſneſs and truth are more productive of happineſs than ſin. But I think it erroneous, to ſuppoſe, that a being, who is capable of learning any thing, cannot learn, ſome time ſhort of *eternity*, that it

is better to do *right*, than *wrong*. Should we argue, however, that that might, in some cases, be true, it would destroy the idea of complete and positive misery, for which my opponent contends. Complete misery would not admit of a prospect which could administer the smallest *hope*; in which case, the soul would have no object which could possibly induce it to action; then would the soul become inert, and its *existence* would be *destroyed*, and become not a subject of happiness, or misery.

I would argue, again, from a reasonable idea, admitted by all, viz. that mankind, in their moral existence, originated in God. Why then do we deny his final assimilation with the fountain from whence he sprang? The streams and rivers which water the hill country, run in every direction, as the make of land occasions. They are stained with various mines and soils, through which they pass; but at last, they find their entrance into the ocean, where their different courses are at an end, and they are tempered like the fountain which receives them. Though man, at present, forms an aspect similar to the waters in their various courses, yet, in the end of his race, I hope he will enjoy an union with his God, and with his fellows.

Having given a few hints, from the nature of moral beings, in favor of my general plan, I ſhall beg the attention of the reader to ſome evidences, from the ſcriptures of truth, in favor of univerſal holineſs and happineſs. The method I intend to purſue, will be concluſive; for I am determined to admit no ſcripture, as evidence, in this caſe, that needs any interpretation to cauſe it to mean what I wiſh to prove; therefore, I ſhall produce but a ſmall part of the ſcriptures which I conceive have a direct meaning in favor of univerſaliſm.

It will not be doubted, that man was created in Chriſt, who the apoſtle ſays, is the *head* of *every man*. To this point I have already attended, in this work, and ſufficiently proved it. I have, alſo, argued, that the *formation* of man was after his *creation*, as appears from the account given in Geneſis. Now, what I wiſh to prove, from ſcripture, is a complete deliverance of the whole humanity from mortality, and the governing power of the law of ſin which is found in our members, to a reinſtatement in the heavenly Adam of immortality, where the law of the ſpirit of life will be the whole governing power, to which man will be ſubjected. It ſeems reaſonable to conclude, that man, in a *ſpiritual ſenſe*, was created in *Chriſt*, the

heavenly nature, as his body was *formed* in *Adam*, the *earthly*. And as all our *bodies* came from that *one formation*, so all our *spirits* came from that *one creation*. As it is by the *nature* of this one *formed* creature that we are all brought into a ſtate of *moral death*, ſo it muſt be by the *ſpirit* of this one *created* man that all will be brought, finally, to the enjoyment of *ſpiritual life* and *peace*. There is a paſſage in Acts iii, 20, 21, which reads very literally, in proof of my argument. "And he ſhall ſend Jeſus Chriſt, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven muſt receive until the *times* of *reſtitution* of *all things*, which God hath ſpoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets ſince the world began." Can there be any diſpute, in the reader's mind, reſpecting the nature of this reſtitution? Will any one pretend, that this reſtitution is only reinſtating man in a ſtate of probation? If that was the object of Chriſt's coming, into our world, if that was intended by his death and reſurrection, was not the work already done, when Peter ſpake theſe words? Why then does he ſpeak of the times of reſtitution yet to come? Or, if this reſtitution of *all* things only meant the reſtitution of honor to the law, by the ſufferings of Chriſt, I aſk, again, was this not alſo paſt, when Peter ſpake theſe

words ? I cannot conceive, that a reſtitution of man to any ſtate which he has occupied, in fleſh and blood, is worthy of the goſpel plan ; for it is ſaid, of man, in his earthly nature, his *best* eſtate is *vanity*. But if we view the plan of the reſtitution of all things, which is to be accompliſhed in the fullneſs of times, a reſtitution or reſtoration from mortality and ſin, to a ſtate of immortality and righeouſneſs, it is conſiſtent with ſcripture, and worthy of God. If my opponent, in his ſtruggles, ſhould ſay, *things* does not refer to *men*, I would aſk, what the word, *things*, does mean, in ſcripture, when uſed as it is in the paſſage above quoted ? I cannot gueſs, to what he would apply it. I will quote two paſſages more, where the word is uſed ; ſee Col. i. 20, "And (having made peace through the blood of his croſs) by him to reconcile all things to himſelf, by him, I ſay, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." That the *things* to be reconciled are *men*, may be ſeen, by verſe 21, "And you that were ſometimes alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." The way, in which Chriſt effected this work, is expreſſed in the 22d verſe, "in the body of his fleſh, through death, to preſent you holy, and unblameable, and

unreproveable in his sight." Eph. i. 10. "That in the dispensation of the *fulness* of *times*, he might gather together *in one all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." The reader will do well to observe the similarity between the last quoted passage and that in Acts. *There*, it is said, "until the *times* of the *restitution* of *all things*," and *here*, it is said, "that in the dispensation of the fullness of *times*, he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ." The 11th verse says, "in whom also *we* have obtained an inheritance." No doubt can be entertained, respecting the *things* to be restored and reconciled, and gathered together in Christ. There is part of the words of Peter which I quoted from Acts, which ought to be particularly noticed, in order to cause those who have said, the doctrine for which I contend is a new doctrine, to consider whether they are right in that matter. The words are these, "Which *God* hath spoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets, since the world began." If all God's holy prophets believed in the doctrine of the restitution of all things, I hardly think it is so modern as some pretend.

I will next call the attention of the reader to what the holy prophets have said, in support of the doctrine of the restitution

of all things: But as their teſtimony ſtands on the promiſe of God to Abraham, which contains the fulneſs of the doctrine for which I contend, I will notice it, in the firſt place, as the ſum of all which the prophets have ſaid, concerning the coming of the Juſt One, and the glory of his kingdom; ſee Geneſis xii, 3. "And I will bleſs them that bleſs thee, and curſe him that curſeth thee, and in thee ſhall all families of the earth be bleſſed." This promiſe is expreſſed in chap. xxii. verſe 18, thus, "And in thy *seed* ſhall *all* the nations of the earth be bleſſed." That there may be no diſpute what this bleſſing is, and that the reader may ſee it to be *juſtification* through faith, ſee Gal. iii, 8. "And the ſcripture, foreſeeing that God would juſtify the heathen through *faith*, preached before the goſpel unto Abraham ſaying, in thee ſhall all nations be bleſſed. What a glorious foundation for hope is here. How bleſſed was Abraham when he rejoiced in the day of Jeſus. How bleſſed were the prophets of the Lord who ſaw theſe things, though afar off; the ſight weaned their affections from all earthly things; they ſought a city which hath *foundation*, whoſe builder and maker is God. O, thanks be to my God, ſince I can call thee ſo; the belief of this, thy promiſe, produces as much heaven, as I

am able to bear, while in the body. When Jacob bleſſed his ſons, he ſpake of the coming of Shiloh, unto whom, ſaith he, ſhall the gathering of the people be; ſee Gen. xlix, 10. How exactly does this teſtimony of the Patriarch agree with that of the apoſtle's; "Unto him ſhall the *gathering* of the *people* be," "That in the diſpenſation of the fullneſs of times, he might *gather together* in *one all things* in *Chriſt*." We will hear what the prophet David ſays, concerning the kingdom of Chriſt, Pſalm lxxii, 11. "Yea, *all* kings ſhall fall down before him; *all nations* ſhall *ſerve* him." Verſe 14, "He ſhall redeem their ſoul from deceit and violence." Verſe 17, And men ſhall be bleſſed in him, all nations ſhall call him bleſſed." If any wiſh to argue, that David meant no other than Solomon, by the king's ſon, let them take notice of the 7th and 8th verſes, "In his days ſhall the righteous flouriſh; and abundance of peace ſo long as the moon endureth. He ſhall have dominion alſo from ſea to ſea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." The moon yet endures, but the reign of Solomon does not. The kingdom ſpoken of, in the text, was to be univerſal; but Solomon's was not. Let us take particular notice of the 11th verſe, "Yea, *all* kings ſhall fall down before him." Shall *all* the cruel tyrants

of the earth bow down to him who was born in a ſtable? Shall *all* the haughty kings of proud and wealthy nations bow down to him whoſe choſen companions, when on earth, were poor fiſhermen? Will you, my opponent, ſay this is a pleaſing doctrine to the carnal mind? Herod, who cauſed the maſſacre in Bethlehem, in order to murder Chriſt in infancy, could hardly be perſuaded that it was agreeable to his carnal mind to bow before Jeſus, at the head of this little band of martyrs. No carnal mind muſt be crucified before all this can be done.

Would it pleaſe the preſent kings of Europe, to tell them, to beat their ſwords into ploughſhares, and their ſpears into pruning hooks, and to learn war no more? Would it be agreeable to their carnal, proud and haughty minds, to ſubmit to the religion of the Savior? Which of them would, in order to gratify carnal mindedneſs, abandon all his equipage, his horſes and chariots of ſtate, mount a forlorn *ass*, ride into an enemy's land, preach peace and ſalvation to his inveterate foes, die by cruel hands, and pray for his murderers in death? And can you believe that *all* the kings of the earth can bow down before the Savior, with any more gratification to carnal mindedneſs, than they could imitate him, in his life and

death? "*All nations* ſhall *ſerve* him." If *all* nations ſerve Chriſt, will they not all be bleſſed in him, according to the promiſe? I do not argue that any will be bleſſed in Chriſt, who do not ſerve him; but the text ſays, all nations *ſhall* ſerve him. Pſalm xxxvii. 10, "For yet a little while, and the wicked ſhall not be, yea, thou ſhalt diligently conſider his place, and it ſhall not be." Verſe 36, "Yet he paſſed away, and he was not, yea I ſought him, but he could not be found." If the wicked continue in ſin as long as God exiſts, it appears to me to be improper to ſay, yet a *little* while, and the *wicked* ſhall not *be*. And if God has prepared a *place* of *endleſs torments* for the *wicked*, and that in *ſight* of the *righteous* in heaven, it is hardly proper to ſay, thou ſhalt diligently conſider his *place*, and it ſhall not *be*. And if the wicked are to be tormented forever, in ſight of the righteous, why is it ſaid, "I ſought him, but he could not be found?" Pſalm xxii. 27, "*All* the ends of the world ſhall *remember* and *turn* unto the Lord, and all the *kindreds* of the nations ſhall worſhip before thee." Who will doubt the ſalvation of thoſe who *turn* unto the Lord and worſhip before him? See Pſalm ii. 7, 8, "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath ſaid unto me, thou art my Son; this

day have I begotten thee. Aſk of me, and I ſhall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion." Compare this beautiful paſſage with one like it in Col. i. 19, "For it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould *all fullness dwell.*" In what a capacious Savior did David believe!—Should a preacher, at the preſent day, recite the words which I have juſt quoted, he would immediately be accuſed of holding the heretical doctrine of *universal salvation*, as his hearers might be pleaſed to call it; or, ſhould he communicate the doctrine half as clearly as it is communicated in thoſe quotations, that part of his audience who were warmly oppoſed to the doctrine would grow uneaſy, while thoſe, who favored the doctrine, would be ſatisfied their ſpeaker did ſo likewiſe. Some method muſt be uſed to explain thoſe ſcriptures differently from what they ſay, or the doctrine for which I contend is fairly proved by them.

Let us paſs to the propheſies of Iſaiah; ſee chap. xxv. 6, 7, 8, "And in this mountain ſhall the Lord of hoſts make unto *all* people a feaſt of fat things, a feaſt of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow of wines on the lees well refined. And he will deſtroy in this mountain the *face* of the *covering* caſt over *all people*,

and the veil that is ſpread over *all* nations. He will ſwallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people ſhall be taken away from off *all* the earth: for the Lord hath ſpoken it." No one will doubt, that the proviſions here ſpoken of are thoſe which are provided in the goſpel of ſalvation.

In the firſt place, then, obſerve, it is made for *all* people; this proves, that it was the intention of him who made the feaſt, that *all* people ſhould ſhare of its divine benefits.

2dly. It is teſtified, that the veil of darkneſs, which was over *all* people, ſhould finally be taken away.

3dly. That death is to be ſwallowed up in victory and tears wiped from off *all faces*. And,

Laſtly. That the rebuke of God's people ſhould be taken from off *all* the *earth*. And the evidence given to prove it would all be done, is, the Lord hath ſpoken it.

It is of no avail, for any to pretend, that though the proviſions of the goſpel were provided for *all* people, yet, *all* will not partake of them, let the reaſons be what they may; for, if God wipes tears from off *all* faces *all* muſt receive the benefits of goſpel grace and peace. Compare this teſtimony with 1. Cor. xv. 54,

"So when this corruptible ſhall have put on incorruption, and this mortal ſhall put on immortality, then ſhall be brought to paſs the ſaying that is written death is ſwallowed up in victory." Again, with Rev. xxi. 4, "And God ſhall wipe away *all* tears from their eyes, and there ſhall be no more death, neither ſorrow nor crying, neither ſhall there be any more pain: for the former things are paſſed away."—How can it be juſtly ſaid, that death is ſwallowed up in victory, when the fact is, death will reign as long as God exiſts? Or, how can it be ſaid, that God ſhall wipe *all* tears from the eyes of men, if millions are to mourn to an endleſs eternity? Or, why is it ſaid, there ſhall be no more ſorrow, crying nor pain, if ſorrow, crying and infinite pain, are never to ceaſe? Iſa. ix. 6, 7, the Savior is propheſied of, as poſſeſſing a kingdom, the increaſe of which ſhould have no end. To the ſame purpoſe, ſee alſo Daniel vii. 14, "And there was given him *dominion*, and *glory*, and a kingdom, that *all people*, nations, and languages, ſhould ſerve him; his dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed."

Obſerve, "*All people, nations*, and languages, *ſhall ſerve him*." If a great

part of the human race are to exist in endless rebellion against Christ and his kingdom, it seems that the prophet was not only ignorant of it, but believed the reverse. Isaiah xlix. 6, "And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my *salvation* unto the ends of the earth." Verse 8, I will preserve thee, and give thee for a *covenant* of the people," &c.

For the strength of this *covenant* see Jer. xxxiii. 20, "Thus saith the Lord; if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant," &c.

When men are possessed of sufficient *agency* to stop the wheels of time, to silence the motion of the solar system, and to disannul God's covenant with day and night, then day and night will depend on the *will* of man. So, likewise, when he has *agency* to disannul that covenant which is ordered, and in *all things* sure, then his eternal salvation will depend on himself, and not on his God.

Attend to one similitude of the Redeemer's glory from the prophecy of Ezekiel

xvii. laſt paragraph, " Thus ſaith the Lord God, I will alſo take of the higheſt branch of the high cedar, and will ſet it ; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent : in the mountain of the height of Iſrael will I plant it : and it ſhall bring forth boughs and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar : and under it ſhall dwell all fowl of every wing ; in the ſhadow of the branches thereof ſhall they dwell. And all the trees of the field ſhall know that I the Lord have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, & have made the dry tree to flouriſh : I the Lord have ſpoken, and have done it." Time would fail me, to write one half that might be quoted from the prophets, on this ſubject. I aſk for no explanation, on their teſtimony ; If what they ſay, does not prove my doctrine, I will not have recourſe to explanations.

I have reaſoned, from the goodneſs of God, to prove, that it is his will, that all men ſhould, finally, be holy and happy ; I will now call proof from divine revelation, to the ſame idea ; ſee St. Paul's 1ſt Epiſtle to Timothy ii. 4, " who will have *all* men to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." What could induce St Paul to write this ſentence, if

he did not believe it? My opponent will say, he supposes Paul did believe it, and will acknowledge he believes it himself. Then, I say, all, for which I argue, is granted. But my opponent has a *method* by which he can *explain* this passage so that it may be true, and yet God may will the endless misery of millions. It is only to say, that the passage is expressive of God's *revealed will*, but not of his *secret will*; arguing that his *revealed will* is in *direct opposition* to a *will* which he has seen fit not to reveal!

Though much use is made of this method, in order to shun the force of this passage and many others, if there is any propriety in it, it is out of my sight; or, if it would not betray a want of good sense, in any other case, I will leave my reader to judge.

To say, God's *revealed will* is contrary to his eternal and unrevealed will, would, in me, be blasphemy of the first magnitude; yet I do not doubt the sincerity of those who frequently say it. But it is not in a direct sense charging God with hypocrisy? However shocking it may seem, I know of no other light in which to view it.

Again, if God has a will which he has not revealed, and my opponent knows what it is, I would ask how he came by

this knowledge? God's revealed will is, that *all* men ſhould be ſaved; but his *ſecret* will is, that moſt of them ſhould be endleſsly miſerable! I would aſk, when this will was a ſecret? It has been openly talked of, by *limitarians*, ever ſince the light of the goſpel advanced ſo as to diſcover the apoſtacy of chriſtians.

St. Paul ſpeaks of the myſtery of God's will which he purpoſed in himſelf, which the apoſtle ſays, God has made known; ſee Eph. i. 9, "Having made known unto us the myſtery of his will, according to his good pleaſure, which he purpoſed in himſelf." And in verſe 10, he tells what this *will* is; but it is very different from what my oppoſer ſays the *hidden* will of God is; "That in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, he might gather together in one *all* things in Chriſt, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." St. Peter ſays, God is not willing that any ſhould *perish*, but that all ſhould come unto repentance.

In ſhort I cannot ſee the propriety of ſaying that God *will* have *all* men to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth, if he predeſtinated from all eternity, millions for endleſs miſery; and if he created any to glorify him, in endleſs torments, I cannot ſee why he ſhould

not be willing for them to perish, and answer the end for which he made them.

Again, what is that truth which God wills *all* men to know? According to the words of the text, it must be a truth consonant to their salvation, or they could not be saved, and yet believe the truth. For instance, suppose, out of the whole alphabet, all are to be endlessly miserable, except the *vowel* letters, and the whole alphabet was brought to the knowledge of the truth; surely the vowels would believe they were to be saved, but all the consonants would believe they were going into endless torments; and the faith of the consonants would be as *true* a faith, as that of the vowels; but how could the consonants enjoy salvation, while possessing this faith?

There are some who do not admit my general system, who will admit this part of it, viz. that it is the *will* of God, that all men should finally be holy and happy; but say, at the same time, that it depends on the creature's accepting of offered mercy, on the rational conditions of gospel obedience; making gospel obedience a pre-requisition to salvation; while I contend, that gospel obedience is, in fact, gospel salvation.

To be be saved from sin is, surely, a gospel salvation; and to be obedient, ac-

cording to the dictates of gospel grace, is salvation from sin. There is just as much propriety in making obedience a condition, on which salvation is granted, as there would be for a physician to propose, to a patient, in a fit of the asthma, that he would afford relief, on condition the patient should first breathe easy! However, if it be granted, that it is God's *will* that *all* men should, finally, be holy and happy, I will more directly answer the supposition that this *will* may fail, by the words of St. Paul; see Eph. i. 11, "In whom we also have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated, according to the purpose of him who worketh *all things* after the *council* of his *own will*." If God will have all men to be saved, and worketh *all things* after the council of his *own will*, it proves that for which I contend, as fully as any thing can be proved from scripture. My opponent, perhaps, will say, (as many have said to me in conversation) after meeting with much difficulty, in arguing, "any thing may be proved, by scripture." To which, I reply, there is one thing, that the scriptures do not prove, neither can all the ingenuity of man make them substantiate it, and that is the *endless misery* of a *moral being*.

If any of my opposers can prove, by scripture, the *endless* duration of sin and

misery, as plainly as the two passages above recited prove universal holiness and happiness, I will never contend any more, on the subject.

I will take further notice of Paul's communication to Timothy. He goes on, in the 5th and 6th verses, to give Timothy a reason for what he had asserted; "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all*, to be testified in due time." The apostle's reasoning is evidently good and plain; for God would not have given his Son a *ransom* for *all*, if it were not his *will* that *all* should be saved; and if it is God's *will* it ought to be our's; therefore, it is right to *pray* for *all*. If the ransom was paid for *all* it argues, that it was the intention of the Ransomer, that *all* should be benefitted.

What would have been the astonishment of the world, after the immortal Washington had caused to be paid a ransom for *all* the American prisoners who were in Algerine slavery, if he had told the Dey that he did not want more than one quarter of those captives sent home to the land of liberty and to the enjoyment of their families, for which they had so long sighed in bondage; and that he might wear out the rest with fatigue and whips?

But the good man's ſoul was never ſatisfied until they *all* came home, and with ſongs of joyous liberty hailed the land of their nativity! And bleſſed be the Captain of our ſalvation; he, alſo, ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul and be ſatisfied, when *all* the "ranſomed of the Lord ſhall return and come to Zion, with ſongs and everlaſting joys upon their heads, when they ſhall obtain joy and gladneſs, and ſorrow and ſighing ſhall flee away."

The reader's attention is now invited to thoſe ſcriptures which, in *expreſſion*, are more particularly applicable to the deliverance of mankind from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The whole of the 15th chapter of the 1ſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, was intended to refute thoſe who denied the reſurrection; but as that doctrine is not denied by my opponent, I ſhall take notice only of thoſe parts which affect the argument between us; ſee verſe 20, "But now is Chriſt riſen from the dead, and become the *firſt fruits* of them that ſlept."—Chriſt, as the firſt fruits of them who ſlept, is repreſented by the heave offering under the law. See xiii. 19, 20, "Then ſhall it be, that when ye eat the bread of the land, ye ſhall offer up an heave-offering unto the Lord; ye ſhall offer up a

cake of the firſt of your dough for an heave-offering, as ye do the heave-offering of the threſhing floor, ſo ſhall ye heave it." Exodus xxii. 29, "Thou ſhalt not delay to offer the firſt of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors; the firſt born of thy ſons ſhalt thou give unto me;" ſee, alſo, Num. xviii. 15. By the offering of the firſt ripe fruits, the whole of the ſucceeding harveſt was ſanctified; and in the firſt born which were redeemed, the ſucceeding fruits of the womb were conſidered holy; ſee Acts xxvi. 23. "That Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and that he ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the dead." Chriſt being the firſt who roſe from the dead, and riſing as the firſt fruits, ſanctifies *all* the reſt, as did the firſt fruits under the law. St. Paul's comment on firſt fruits, is very illuſtrative of the ſcriptural meaning thereof, ſee Rom. xi. 16, "For if the firſt fruits be holy, the lump is alſo holy; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches."

In the heave-offering under the law, there is a beautiful repreſentation of our Savior. The ſheaf taken from the field, being ſeparated from *all* the reſt of the ſame growth, repreſents the ſeparation of Jeſus Chriſt from mankind to be holy unto the Lord; and the ſanctification of the whole harveſt being by the firſt ripe fruits, is to ſhew us, that our ſanctification is in

Jeſus, the firſt fruits of them that ſlept.—The ſame may be clearly ſeen, in the inſtance of the dough; a certain part of it was to be ſeparated from the reſt, for an offering unto the Lord, in which the remaining part of the *lump* (as the apoſtle calls it) was conſidered holy.

Theſe obſervations are made here, in order to draw the reader's attention more cloſely to the labors of the apoſtle, which we have under conſideration; for he goes on immediately to ſhow what he means, by the *lump* ſpoken of in the Romans; ſee verſe 21, "For ſince by man came death, by man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead."

Let me here obſerve, that death came by the earthly man, and the reſurrection came by the heavenly man, which is in point to prove, that the plan of the goſpel is to deliver mankind from the earthly Adam, to the immortality of the heavenly.

Perhaps none would diſpute what I here contend for, provided I did not extend the cure as extenſive as the malady; but I ſhall alſo contend for this, and will clearly prove it by the apoſtle's teſtimony; ſee verſe 22, "For as in Adam *all die. even so in Christ* ſhall *all* be made *alive.*" It is not poſſible for me to ſtate the doctrine more *concise* and *positive* than the apoſtle

has done, in the paſſage quoted. But I am willing to attend to my opponent's objections as I proceed. He will ſay, he does not diſpute that the apoſtle here meant *all* mankind, but that he only intended they would *all* be raiſed from the dead, not that *all* would be delivered from condemnation and ſin. But I will reſt my argument on the words themſelves; I ſay, if *all* men are made *alive* in Chriſt, they cannot be ſaid to be *out* of Chriſt dead, or alive, ſinful, or holy.

The preſent ſtate of our being is derived from Adam, the earthly nature; and, in a natural ſenſe, we are *all in him.*— Our future ſtate of exiſtence, we derive entirely from the heavenly nature; and, therefore, it is ſaid, *all* ſhall be made alive in Chriſt. The apoſtle goes on ſtill further, to ſhow the order of the before mentioned work, arguing, from the *firſt fruits*, the *whole family of mankind.*— See 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 25, "But every man in his own order: Chriſt the firſt fruits; afterward they that are Chriſt's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he ſhall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he ſhall have put down *all* rule, and *all* authority, and power. For he muſt reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."—

Chriſt is here again ſpoken of as the firſt fruits, in the order of the reſurrection, which conſiſts of *three* parts.

Firſt. Of Chriſt himſelf, who was the firſt that roſe from the dead.

Secondly. Thoſe who are Chriſt's at his coming, which coming, I will not endeavor to point out, as it makes nothing, in reſpect to the particular argument in which I am at preſent engaged.

Thirdly. The coming of the end, which cannot be, until he hath put down *all* rule, authority and power, and *every enemy* has ſubmitted; at which time, the Mediator delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father.

Then ſhall the great work of reconciliation be finiſhed, and the labors of the Redeemer completed, with immortal honor. Then ſhall *all* the millions of the human race be reconciled to God, through Chriſt and ſhall ſing; ſee Rev. v. 11, 12, 13, 14, "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beaſts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands; ſinging with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honor, and glory and bleſſings. And ev-

ery creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, & under the eath, & ſuch as are inthe ſea, & *all* that are in them, heard I, ſaying, Bleſſing & honor, & glory, & power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, & unto the Lamb, forever & ever. And the four beaſts ſaid, amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down, and worſhipped him that liveth forever and ever."

The reader will obſerve, that ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands of *angels*, *beasts* and *elders*, firſt declare the Lamb, who had been ſlain, to be worthy to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honor, and glory, and bleſſings; then *every* creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and *all* that are in them, ſay Bleſſing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him who ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. Then the elders and beaſts, who firſt pronounced him thus worthy, fell down and worſhipped him who liveth forever and ever.

There is nothing, in all the ſacred writings more aſtoniſhingly beautiful, than this account; neither do I think it poſſible for the imagination to paint any thing half ſo grand and ſublime. I am all aſtoniſhment! To realize, by faith, the accompliſhment of this glorious prediction,

tranſcends every other thought, or idea, of which the mind is ſuſceptible.

There is no room for my opponent to argue, againſt the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs, while this paſſage of divine truth lies in ſight. There are no expreſſions left out of this paſſage that would make it more extenſive.

May I not aſk my oppoſer if he is not willing to acknowledge what myſterious powers have acknowledged, that Chriſt, the dear Lamb who hath been ſlain, is worthy to receive as extenſive worſhip as is declared in the paſſage quoted?

When the four beaſts and the elders ſaw univerſal nature bending before the object of their worſhip, they immediately fell down, anxious to excel, and worſhipped him who liveth forever and ever. If my opponent thinks Chriſt is not worthy of ſo much worſhip, he thinks leſs of him than *I* do, and leſs than I wiſh *he* did.

There are yet remaining many paſſages in the xvth of Corinthians, which are in point, to prove what I am contending for, even more than is, at this time, neceſſary to introduce. A few more, however, may be proper, with ſome few remarks. See verſe 28, "And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject to him that did put

all things under him, that God may be all in all."

What muſt we underſtand, by all things being *subdued* unto him? Will any one ſay, all that is meant by it, is, Chriſt will then have power over *all* ſhen, whereby he can reward the righteous, and torment the wicked? When did he not poſſeſs this power? When were not all things in ſubjection to Chriſt, enough for thoſe purpoſes? The ſubjection of all things to Chriſt, muſt mean ſomething, and it is reaſonnble to believe, thht it means the reconciliation of the heart to holineſs. Can a ſoul in ſin, employed in blaſpheming the Incommunicable Name, be ſaid to be in ſubjection to Chriſt, in any way that anſwers to the text? I do not think any will contend for it.

The only ſubjection which is accepable to Chriſt, is a broken and contrite heart, which he will not deſpiſe. The plan, then, of the goſpel, is univerſal ſubmiſſion to Chriſt, in holineſs and happineſs.

The delivery of the kingdom of Chriſt to the Father is declared, in the laſt clauſe of the paſſage quoted, of which I have before taken notice, in this work, in order to ſhew the dependence of Chriſt on the Eternal and Self exiſtent. "Then," it is ſaid, 'God ſhall be *all* in *all*." In what ſenſe, will God be *all* in *all*, at the cloſe of

the Redeemer's proceſs, that he is not now, or always was? Anſwer, he, that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. When *all* men are brought to love God ſupremely, and their fellow creatures as themſelves, it will then be manifeſt, that we are nothing, only as we exiſt in God; therefore, God will be *all*. And as the eternal ſpirit of love, which is the governing principle of the heavenly man, will be the governing principle of each ſoul thus reconciled to the law of love, it may juſtly be ſaid, that God is *in all*. See verſes 47, 48, 49, "The firſt man is of the earth, earthly; the ſecond man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthly, ſuch are they alſo that are earthly; and as is the heavenly, ſuch are they alſo that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we ſhall alſo bear the image of the heavenly." As we have all been partakers of the earthly Adam, ſo the apoſtle argues, we ſhall be partakers, in the reſurrection, of the Second Adam, whom he calls the Lord from heaven. See verſes 51, 52, 53, 54, "Behold, I ſhew you a myſtery, we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall *all* be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the laſt trump; for the trumpet ſhall ſound, and the dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and

we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

If death, sin and sorrow are to remain, as long as God exists, how can it be said, death is swallowed up in victory? If the apostle believed any part of the family of man would finally be excluded from the blessings of the gospel, why did he not just hint something of it, in this account of the close of the Mediatorial kingdom? Did he consider it a matter of *too small moment to mention?* If he *did*, he is *inexcusable* for precluding the idea, by *plain* and *positive testimony*. See his conclusion, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave? where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through the Lord Jesus Christ." If sin remains without end, it being the *sting* of death, when the question is asked, O death, where is thy *sting?* Sin may answer, Here I am, and here I will be, in spite of him who undertook to destroy the works of the devil, and here I will boast of my power as long as he does of his,

whom angels adore, and I hate! Phil. iii. 21, "Who ſhall change our vile body, that it may be faſhioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able *even* to ſubdue *all things* unto himſelf." Obſerve, who ſhall change our vile body. In a former quotation, it is ſaid, "we ſhall *all* be changed;" and in the preſent paſſage, it is ſaid, whereby he is able even to ſubdue *all things* unto himſelf. In a former quotation, it is ſaid, "And when *all things* ſhall be *ſubdued* unto him."

Let us hear what our bleſſed Lord himſelf ſays, in reſpect to his miſſion. St. John v. 22, 23, "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that *all* men ſhould *honor* the *Son*, even as they *honor* the *Father*. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, which hath ſent him." In the ſenſe in which this paſſage was ſpoken, it is evident, that the ſinner does neither honor the Father, nor the Son, and the plain teſtimony of the text is, that *all men* ſhould honor both. Compare this with Philip. ii. 9, 10, 11, "Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above *every* name; that at the name of Jeſus, every knee ſhould bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and things under the

earth ; and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." As, in the other paſſage, the exaltation of the Savior is firſt ſpoken of, and then the grand intention, in his exaltation, ſhown, ſo in this, there, it is for the purpoſe that *all* men ſhould honor him ; and here, it is, that unto him, every knee ſhould bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ; and that every tonguh ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of the Father.

Of this glorious and ſoul-reviving truth, the prophet, Iſaiah was not ignorant, but ſpeaks of it moſt clearly ; ſee chap. xlv. 22, 23, 24, 25, " Look unto me, and be ye ſaved, all the ends of the earth ; for I am God, and there is none elſe. I have ſworn by myſelf, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteouſneſs, and ſhall not return, that unto me every knee ſhall bow, every tongue ſhall ſwear. Surely, ſhall ſay, in the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength : *even* to him ſhall come; and all that incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed. In the Lord ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory." The reader will obſerve, I have left out ſome ſupplied words, in the above quotation, by which, the paſſage reads without ambiguity.

Had the inſpired prophet been poſſeſſed of an accurate knowledge of the diſpute in which I am engaged, I do not ſee how he could have written a ſentence more pertinently to my argument; and I have not a doubt but the Spirit intended the paſſage for the ſame purpoſe for which I have uſed it.

St. Paul, in the viiith of Romans, ſhows the extent of redemption in ſo ſtrong terms as to admit of no poſſible evaſion; ſee verſes 22, 23, "For we know that the *whole creation* groaneth, and traveleth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourſelves alſo, which have the firſt fruits of the Spirit, even we ourſelves groan within ourſelves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

If the reader will be at the trouble of examining this paſſage, with its connexion, that, for which I contend, will appear plainly proved by it.

There is no end to proofs of univerſal reconciliation to God; for every thing of a moral nature teſtifies it, and all material nature is a figure of it. The miniſtry of reconciliation, which, St. Paul ſays, was committed to himſelf and others, is, that God was in Chriſt reconciling the *world* unto himſelf, not imputing unto them their treſpaſſes. The truth of Chriſt's dying

for *all* is the foundation of the apoſtle's argument on this ſubject; which truth the apoſtle ſays, he was conſtrained to believe, by the love of Chriſt; for thus ſaith he, "the love of Chriſt conſtraineth us; becauſe we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for *all*, that they which live, ſhould not henceforth live unto themſelves, but unto him which died for them, and roſe again," 2 Cor. v. 14, &c.

I may as well ſtop here as any where, for, as I juſt ſaid, there is no end; and if thoſe ſcriptures, which I have quoted, be true, that, which I have endeavored to prove, is proved; but if they be not, more of the ſame teſtimony would prove nothing.

There is but one method left for my opponent, by which he can further oppoſe me; and that is by denying the whole ſyſtem of divine revelation, and man's ſuſceptibility of rational ideas: But as that would equally deſtroy all for which he would contend, he will undoubtedly be cautious.

We now ſee clearly, that it is God's will, according to his eternal purpoſe, purpoſed in himſelf, that *all* men ſhould finally be *holy* and *happy*; that it was the intention of the Savior's miſſion; that the prophets, by the ſpirit of prophecy, long

foreſaw this univerſal and godlike glorious plan of grace ; that every good principle in man ſtands up in teſtimony of ſo divine a ſyſtem, that the happineſs of all moral beings is wrapped up in the glorious iſſue of the miniſtration of reconciliation, and that it is, in reality, oppoſed by none, but by *unreconciled* beings, unholy principles, and unlawful deſires. And ſhall we ſay, the eternal good will of him who dwelt in the buſh, muſt fail at laſt ? Muſt the teſtimony of the prophets fall to the ground ? Muſt the Captain of our ſalvation, who warred in righteouſneſs, who reddened his garments in his own blood, who bore the ſins of the world, and ſuffered death, in agony, to obtain his lawful inheritance, be robbed of them at laſt ? Were this believed in heaven, the royal diadem would fall from the head of him whom all heaven adores, and the higheſt arch angel would faint away ! But bleſſed be the Lord, and bleſſed be his truth, its divine power ſhall cauſe the Leviathan of infidelity to bite the ground, ſhall rend the veil which is caſt over all nations, and ſhall more and more manifeſt divine righteouſneſs and the name in which it is found, in which name alone is ſalvation. In the days of the apoſtles, the greateſt object in preaching the goſpel of Chriſt, was to prove him to be the Savior of the world,

the true Meſſiah of the law, urging, that he died for *all*, that he made no diſtinction between Jew and Gentile, but had broken down the partition wall between them, for the glorious purpoſe of making, of the *twain*, *one new man* in everlaſting fellowſhip and eternal peace. But how hath the gold changed, how hath the moſt fine gold become dim! The main apparent object, at the preſent day, is to prove the object of the Savior's miſſion, as it reſpects the ſalvation of ſinners, extremely limited, and that but few of the human race will finally be the redeemed of the Lord to the praiſe of his glory; that the great adverſary of righteouſneſs will obtain a much larger conqueſt of ſouls than Chriſt himſelf; and, O, ſhocking to name, eternal juſtice is profaned, by being called to aſſiſt the ſerpent's deſigns, in the endleſs duration of ſin and rebellion againſt God! Thoſe, whom the Lord hath bleſſed with a belief of univerſal holineſs and happineſs, are proſcribed as heretics, infidels, offscourings of the earth, friends to nothing but ſin, and enemies to nothing but *God* and *holiness;* opening a door to licentiouſneſs of every abominable ſpecies, deſtroyers of the pure religion of Chriſt, and nuiſances to ſociety. But is it, in reality, manifeſting a love to ſin, to argue its total deſtruction, by the power of di-

vine righteouſneſs? Is it manifeſting enmity againſt God and the religion of Jeſus, to contend for the propriety of all men's ſerving him, in *holiness* and *happiness?* and are we nuiſances to ſociety, becauſe we endeavor to perſuade all men to love God and one another? Can theſe things be diſpleaſing to him who was born in Bethlehem? Will he not rather greatly bleſs ſuch labors, though performed by thoſe as little eſteemed in the world as were the poor fiſhermen who left their nets, and followed the deſpiſed Nazarene?

Let us aſk a few queſtions. Which reflects the moſt honor on the Divine Character, to contend, it was neceſſary for him to create millions of rational creatures, to hate him, and every divine communication he makes to them, to all eternity, to live in endleſs rebellion againſt him, and endure inconceivable torments, as long as God exiſts; or to ſuppoſe him able and willing to make all his rational creatures love and adore him, yield obedience to his divine law, and exiſt in union and happineſs with himſelf?

Which reflects moſt honor on the Savior, to ſay, that but few will obtain ſalvation by him; and though he died for all men, yet, his death will benefit but few; or to ſay, with the prophet, "He ſhall ſee

of the travail of his ſoul, and be ſatisfied, having reconciled all things to God, through the peace made by the blood of the croſs ?"

If there be joy in heaven over one ſinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine juſt perſons who need no repentance, which would yield the moſt joy to the heavenly hoſts, the repentance of one fourth of mankind, or of the whole ! If the ſervants of Chriſt here on earth deſire the *increase* of *holiness*, and the *decrease* of *ſin*, which would be moſt agreeable to ſuch a deſire, the belief, that the greateſt part of mankind will grow *more* and *more ſinful to all eternity ;* or, to believe, that *ſin* will continually *decrease*, and *righteousness increase*, until the *former* is wholly *destroyed*, and the *latter* becomes *universal ?*

To anſwer the above queſtions, ſo as to favor my opponent's argument, is more than any one would be willing to do ; and which, if done, would involve an endleſs train of ideas too glaringly abſurd to be ſupported. But to anſwer them, agreeably to the nature of divine truth, opens to infinite beauties more ſerene than the morning, and more glorious than the noon day. God, the fountain of living waters, and the eſſence of eternal life, is ſeen, by faith in Jeſus, the ſame to all rational be-

ings, the author, supporter, and blesser of them. Christ Jesus, the head of every man, is beheld as the brightness of the Father's glory, and express image of his person, through whom the eternal hath manifested the riches of his grace, the eternal councils of his love to the world, brought life and immortality to light, and manifested our eternal sonship in the Second Adam. Each holy desire, as the fruit of the Spirit, in the souls of those who believe, feasts on the rich promises of Abraham's God, believing him faithful who hath promised. Heaven hath already received the heave offering of the first ripe fruits, and the fields are white ready to harvest. O, ye laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, be ye not idle. What an extensive field is here in which for the mind to expand and send its desires abroad! The transcendent beauties of salvation have visited the dark regions of mortality, as light and heat from the vernal sun visits the cold and dark north, turning frozen lands into fruitful fields, taking the icy fetters from limpid streams which bend their course to the fountain, bringing the time of the singing of birds, and causing the voice of the turtle to be heard.

'I am come,' says Jesus, 'to send a fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?' All the passages, which

allude to a diſpenſation of fire, which I have obſerved, in this work, are direct evidences, to prove the deſtruction of ſin and all ſinful works, the purification of ſinners, and their eternal reconciliation to holineſs and happineſs. This fire will either overcome ſin, or be overcome by it: But who will argue the latter? If none, then let the former be acknowledged. If you ſay, theſe things appear differently from what you expected they would, before your enquiry, and you find ſomething more intereſting than tradition has taught you; if you feel ſoft, in your mind, towards the ſo much deſpiſed doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs; if you can believe heaven large enough to contain mankind, and begin to breathe in the air of unbounded benevolence, and feel faith mingled with your deſires for the deſtruction of ſin, and the increaſe of holineſs, then come ſtill further. The knowledge of theſe things is *progreſſive*, and *obtained only by degrees*. I give you my hand, in token of love and friendſhip; and my heart, in all faithfulneſs, is yours. Let us ſtill go on and view the heavenly beauties yet to be unfolded, in the plan of the goſpel. I well know there are many difficulties to be ſurmounted; to profeſs univerſal ſalvation, will ſubject ſome to excommunication from regular churches;

others to the pain of being neglected by their neighbors; others to be violently oppoſed by their companions; &, in many inſtances, undoubtedly, the father will be againſt the ſon, and the ſon againſt the father; the mother againſt the daughter, and the daughter againſt the mother; and a man's enemies may be thoſe of his own houſe: But can ſuch difficulties excuſe us for not owning him, who, for us, bore the croſs and deſpiſed the ſhame? All denominations, ſince the world began, have experienced ſome difficulties in their firſt eſtabliſhments. Chriſt and his apoſtles wreſtled hard, and encountered great oppoſition, even to the loſs of all earthly things, with life itſelf. Since the apoſtacy, the denominations which aroſe out of Popery, have, in thouſands of inſtances, ſuffered more than duty calls us to ſuffer, in a land of liberty and toleration. But ſome will ſay, there are none who profeſs the doctrine in my vicinity, except ſome of the lower claſs of people; and if I rank myſelf with them, my titles of honor will do me no good, and my road to the temple of fame will be forever intercepted. Some will ſay to themſelves, I muſt believe the doctrine, I cannot argue againſt it, but I will ſay nothing about it, leſt I ſhould be miſtruſted; I would gladly embrace the

opportunity which Nicodemus did, who went to Jesus by night; but to come out boldly, to the knowledge of the world, is too great a sacrifice. Says another, I am convinced of the truth of the doctrine, but I have preached so much against it, have warned my hearers so much to shun that heresy, I am now ashamed to tell them I believe it. Another feels so dependent on his neighbors, he wishes to have them go forward first. All these circumstances, and many more, bear great weight with various persons, in various circumstances, causing great labor of mind; and those who are under such influences may be said to be heavy ladened. I know of no better remedy for those cases, than an attention to the exhortation of Christ, who said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; take my yoke upon you, learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and you shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

The reader may judge, from those circumstances, whether this doctrine is pleasing to the eternal mind, as its enemies say. Was it pleasing to the pharisees of old, to be taught, by Christ and his disciples, that publicans and harlots should enter the kingdom of heaven before them?

Yes, juſt as pleaſing to their carnal minds, as it is to a profeſſed preacher of Chriſt, who can thank God that he is better than other men, to tell him that thoſe, upon whom he looks ſo much viler than himſelf, ſtand in no more need of pardon than he does. St. Paul, before his converſion to chriſtianity, undoubtedly looked on the doctrine of Chriſt to be exactly calculated to pleaſe wicked men, as the moſt part of thoſe who were diſcipled by it, were publicans and ſinners; and he well knew, that the *foundation* of their *hope* was the *forgiveness* of *ſin*. This he deſpiſed, as did many of his equals in the Jewiſh religion; feeling themſelves whole, they felt no need of a phyſician. They ſuppoſed the goſpel to be a doctrine every way calculated to vitiate and immoralize mankind. Undoubtedly the phariſees often ſaid, of the diſciples of Chriſt, their religion is perfectly ſuited to their characters; they are ſinners, and know not the law; and they have contrived a *very easy way* to get to heaven. But if we aſk St. Paul, after his converſion, what he thought of theſe things, he would undoubtedly give a very different account. For when the Lord met him in the way, and gave him to underſtand his real character, and what he was doing; he was aſtoniſhed, and fell to the earth; his ſins were ſet in order be-

fore him, and his ſoul was greatly troubled. In this ſituation, he learned the neceſſity of the doctrine which he had deſpiſed; experienced the neceſſity of its pardoning mercy; and became as willing to endure perſecution, for its ſake, as he had been to perſecute it before.

When it is underſtood, that goſpel ſalvation is ſalvation from carnal mindedneſs and all its relative ills, to a reconciliation to the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus; if all men were thus ſaved, it would not be argued, that it is pleaſing to the carnal mind. As the doctrine for which I contend, is entirely the reverſe of carnal mindedneſs, ſo it is equally oppoſed to licentiouſneſs; for what can be a ſtronger reſtraint on the paſſions than a belief in God's univerſal goodneſs, and that all men are the objects of his mercy? Such a belief, when it has its proper effects in the mind, raiſes a ſupreme affection for God, and kindles the ſacred fire of love and unbounded benevolence to mankind. If any would diſpute me, on my ſtatement of the conſequences of this faith, I have greatly the advantage; as my opponent does not poſſeſs this faith, he cannot tell the effects of it ſo well as one can who does. However, I will not make uſe of that advantage, having argument in my power that is more than ſufficient. Let my adverſary ſtate

his argument, that we may see the strength of it. The fact is, he has no argument; he can only *assert*, "the doctrine is not productive of love to God or man, but the reverse; and if he believed it, he would commit every sin was in his power." Is it hard to see, that my opponent has made a very fair and full profession of his love to sin, in room of his love to God; and a strong desire to injure his fellow men, in room of serving them in love? What was the elder brother angry for? At what did he grumble? And why did he refuse to go into his father's house? Because the father had received the prodigal, and treated him kindly. At what did the laborers grumble who bore the burden and heat of the day? Because those, who had wrought but one hour, received as much as they, and received their money first. At what did the pharisees and scribes murmur, when they saw all the publicans and sinners come to Jesus to hear him? Because he did not condemn them to hopeless despair, but kindly received them. At what do my opposers rage? At what are they dissatisfied? Not because I exclude them from any privilege, or blessing of the gospel. What, then? I am sorry to name it. It is because I extend those blessings further, and hope they will do more good than what suits them!

As the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs opens an infinite field in which for the mind to expatiate, and learn the goodneſs of God in all his works and providence, it is the moſt animating to a benevolent ſoul of any that was ever believed, in our world, and lays the broadeſt foundation for exhortation to deny ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, to live ſober, righteous and godly lives. How ſtrong are the inducements, from ſuch glorious views of God and his mercy, to lead us to imitate ſuch unbounded goodneſs, in all our intentions and actions. And being fully convinced, that our happineſs is in union with our duty, thoſe who fully believe in the conſequences of atonement, as I have argued them, will ſee the propriety of my endeavoring to ſtir up their pure minds, by way of remembrance, exhorting them to good works in all faithfulneſs, in whatever ſituation duty may call us, or whatever the part may be which our heavenly Father hath called us to act, in his divine and delightſome ſervice.—The duty enjoined on the believer of this doctrine, is as much more extenſive than the duty enjoined by any other faith, as the faith itſelf is more extenſive; and its delights are ſo, likewiſe. If a poor man was offered a thouſand pounds for a day's labor, it would undoubtedly be a very

ſtrong inducement to him to labor. But it is to be obſerved, in this caſe, that it is not the *labor itself* which is the object, but the *large sum of money* with which the laborer expects to be rewarded. It is not the *labor* in which the man delights; could he obtain his *money*, without the *work*, it would be his choice. But when the *labor itself* is all the *enjoyment*, and the *whole object* is *obedience*, the laborer will not wiſh the *time short*, or the *duty small;* no, *eternity is none too long for the soul to contemplate laboring in the endless delights of obedience to his God.*

Thoſe, who believe a future ſtate of happineſs depends on certain duties performed by them, undoubtedly intend to do thoſe duties ſometime before they die; and it is often ſaid, that a procraſtination of thoſe duties, on which ſo much depends, is dangerous, as life is uncertain; yet, they had rather let it alone, until old age deprives them of the common comforts of life; at which time, they may about as well be employed in the *dull* and *disagreeable task* of being *good* as any thing elſe. But thoſe, who conſider their duty as their meat and drink, ought not to need much inviting, to feed on dainties ſo rich. We ſhould hardly believe a man to be in his right mind, who, for eating a good meal of victuals, ſhould charge the

price of it. "*In* keeping thy commandments, there is *great reward*." By theſe obſervations, the reader will ſee how needful it is for us, at all times, to attend to our duty, becauſe "*now* is the accepted time, and *now* is the day of ſalvation," to every willing and obedient ſoul who feels the power of atoning grace; *salvation* is preſent: Truly it is ſaid of wiſdom, "She hath builded her houſe, ſhe hath hewn out her ſeven pillars; ſhe hath killed her beaſts; ſhe hath mingled her wine; ſhe hath alſo furniſhed her table." God, in infinite wiſdom, has conſtituted all moral beings ſo that their duty is their happineſs, and ſtrict obedience fulneſs of joy. Why, then, my brethren, ſhall we ſtarve? Why live poor? Why ſhould we be ſo parſimonious of thoſe heavenly ſtores that can never be exhauſted? "Bleſſed are they who hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs, for they ſhall be filled." "Aſk, and ye ſhall receive; ſeek, and ye ſhall find; knock, and it ſhall be opened unto you." God forbids none; "the Spirit and the bride ſay, come; and let him that heareth, ſay, come; and whoſoever will, let him take of the fountain of the water of life freely." Remember the ſalvation which God wills is a ſalvation *from ſin*. Then, as much as you deſire ſalvation, you will wiſh to avoid ſin and wickedneſs.

There are none who would ſay, they did not want ſalvation; but how many there are who ſay, they want it by their own conduct! No man underſtandingly, wants ſalvation, any further than he wants more holineſs. The univerſaliſt, who is really ſo, prizes his duty as his heaven, as his peace, and as his moſt ſublime enjoyment. How then ſhall we be ſo loſt, ſo blind, and ſo deceived, as to wiſh to ſhun our duty and our happineſs? If we really believe thoſe things, and deſire that others may be brought to ſee and believe the ſame, let us endeavor, in the firſt place, to prove to all men, that ſuch a belief is of real ſervice in cultivating our morals, and in regulating our behavior. And, ſecondly, by uſing our abilities as God hath given, in cool diſpaſſionate reaſoning, with thoſe who do not believe; contending for nothing but the pure principles of love, in meekneſs and all gentleneſs. Never argue for *will* ſake, nor for maſtery; and ſhunning every appearance of *ſophistry*, never ſuffer yourſelves to be anxious about the iſſue of converſation; but ſpeak the words of truth and ſoberneſs, and leave the event to be directed by the ſpirit of God. Falſehood is ſo apt to detect itſelf, that an argument is generally beſt conducted, when the diſputant is refuted by con-

ſequences ariſing from his own ſtatements; and if he cannot ſee and underſtand them for himſelf, it will do no good to ſee them for him. If we can ſee for ourſelves, we do well. If the Lord of the harveſt hath graciouſly been pleaſed to call you by his grace, to preach the word of his goſpel to his purchaſed poſſeſſion; to ſound abroad the trumpet of ſalvation, and to feed the ſheep and lambs of the one true ſhepherd, then remember, that it is required of ſtewards that they are found faithful. St. Paul declared himſelf a debtor both to the Greeks and Barbarians, to the wiſe and unwiſe. He having received a diſpenſation of the goſpel, the grace of which belonged to *all* men, he therby became a debtor to *all*. And if we have received a diſpenſation of the ſame goſpel, we are debtors to all whom this goſpel concerns. How happy is a friend, who has good news, to communicate it to his companions; and ſurely it is an office much to be deſired to carry good news to the diſtreſſed. See the officer when he reads a pardon to one who expects immediate death; his ſoul burſts through his eyes in ſtreams of joy, while he pronounces the words which give life to the dead. But how much more excellent are the labors of thoſe whoſe feet are beautiful on the mountains, who publiſh peace in the Re-

deemer's name, even glad tidings unto all people. Much watchfulnefs is neceſſary, leſt the law of the carnal or old man gets the government of the mind. I will venture to ſay, there never was a preacher more ready, on all occaſions, than the old man which we are exhorted to put off; he is willing, at all times, to aſſiſt, never waiting to be called. He has no objections to preaching about Chriſt, if *Christ* be not preached. He is perfectly willing to ſay, that *ſalvation* is *all* of *God*, and that Chriſt is a whole Savior; but then, it is indiſpenſably neceſſary that *he* ſhould do ſomething; ſuch as aſking, ſeeking, knocking; or, if it be only *accepting* of *offered* mercy, it is all he wants. It may be, the reader will wonder a little at what I here ſay, as I have juſt quoted the exhortation, to aſk, to ſeek, to knock, &c.; but I wiſh to be underſtood, that we muſt aſk, ſeek and knock, not *in* the *name* or *nature* of the *earthly* Adam, but in the *name* and *nature* of the *heavenly* man. The old ſerpent, the devil, is never better pleaſed, than when he can do ſomething which he thinks lays God under ſome obligation to him. If the carnal or old man gets ſo baffled as to be reduced to give up his influence reſpecting our *eternal life* in *Jeſus*, he will immediately propoſe, in his ſtruggles, that all he can do, is to inſure

a bleſſed ſtate, for ſome conſiderable time after we die, ſay for a thouſand years, or any given time; then all muſt depend on the Savior. If the earthly Adam can get us up Jacob's ladder a few ſteps, he is willing that Chriſt ſhould do ſomething by and by. Now the object of all thoſe devices, of which we are not ignorant, (as St. Paul ſays) is to keep us in the ſervice of the fleſh; but remember, he that *soweth* to the *flesh*, ſhall of the *flesh* reap *corruption*. A phariſee, who feels as if ſomething was coming to him more than others receive, perhaps will not be ſcrupulous about the exact quantity. He only wiſhes to have proper attention paid him; if he can flatter himſelf with a *higher seat* in *heaven* than thoſe are to have, on whom he looks as worſe than himſelf, it ſatisfies his carnal pride: Perhaps a period of puniſhment for ſinners, after death, in which they may be juſtly corrected, for not being ſo good and holy as this phariſee, would give him much ſatisfaction. He would then be willing to have the poor wretches delivered from abſolute miſery, and enjoy ſome ſmall conveniences. O, how hard it is, to be a humble diſciple of the meek and lowly Jeſus. It is death to carnal mind. If I preach the goſpel all my life long, ſpend all my time and ſtrength for the good of mankind, and the

honor of my Savior, ſhall I not have ſomething more hereafter, than one who has mocked and derided me? Anſwer, if I have, in truth and meekneſs, preached Chriſt, and have been faithful in his cauſe, ought I not to be thankful, that he has enabled me ſo to do? Have I been the loſer, unleſs I am paid, in the world to come, by having ſome privilege granted me which another may not enjoy? O, bluſh, my ſoul, if thy follies riſe ſo high. No, every moment's faithfulneſs has been ſupplied with ſtreams of divine conſolation; and it ought to be remembered, that, the preacher never refreſhes others, unleſs he himſelf is refreſhed. If I have profeſſed to preach Chriſt, but have preached myſelf, in room of him, undoubtedly I may think there is ſomething coming, as my living has been very poor, while I have thus labored; but the truth is, my *reward* has been *equal* to my *ſervice*. I am willing to acknowledge, that *carnal mind* often contends, that I have done ſo well, I ought, in conſequence, to expect high approbations; and I begin to look *down* on thoſe whom I fancy of leſs magnitude. But, O, the viperous ſting! Well might an apoſtle ſay, "I find a law in my members warring againſt the law of my mind, bringing me into captivity to the law of

ſin which is in my members." Says the ſame apoſtle, "Unto me who am leſs than the leaſt of all ſaints, is this grace given, that I ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable riches of Chriſt." Upon what high advantages did he calculate, above thoſe who were much leſs in labor than himſelf? But, ſays the reader, will not St. Paul fare better than the worſt of ſinners, in eternity? Judge from what he ſays, "This is a faithful ſaying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Chriſt Jeſus came into the world to ſave *sinners*, of whom *I* am *chief*." The more humble we are, the greater our enjoyments. But when all are completely humbled, and perfectly reconciled; when all old things are done away, and all things become new; when he, who ſitteth upon the throne, maketh all things new in deed and in truth, I believe all ſtrife, concerning who ſhall be great in the kingdom of heaven, will be at an end. Ye, who preach righteouſneſs in the great congregations of the people, forget not the exhortation of the Captain of our ſalvation, "*Learn of me.*" What good will all our labors do, unleſs we learn of Chriſt? If we learn of him, he will be unto us, wiſdom, righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption; and we ſhall preach, not ourſelves, but Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, and ourſelves the ſervants

of the people, for Jesus' sake. Remember, again, the exhortation of him who is the leader and commander of the people, "Search the scriptures." Make yourselves acquainted with, and have free recourse to, this great store house of divine riches, that you may be ready to "deal a portion to seven, and also to eight." "Ye are the salt of the earth." As salt preserves and seasons meats so that they are acceptable, so ought the masters of righteousness to endeavor, as far as possible, to preserve mankind from sin, that they may be acceptable members of the church of Christ. "But if the salt has lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men." We cannot be profitable to others, unless we have the savor of the Spirit within us; this lost, and we are good for nothing; and in room of having a mouth, and wisdom, to put gainsayers to silence, we shall be overcome by them, and they will tread us under their feet. "Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But be sure to remember, that, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God." Carnal mind frequently urges the necessity of contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; but then

we muſt contend in a coat of *mail*, and with the weapons of him who fought the life of the *Son* of Jeſſe, Be prepared to meet every kind of oppoſition; we muſt be attacked on every ſide, the adverſary will not leave one ſtone unturned, nor a weapon, in his armor, untried. Be cautious of any ſyſtem of divinity; remember "the path of the juſt is a ſhining light, which ſhineth more and more unto the perfect day." The moment we fancy ourſelves *infallible*, every body muſt come to our peculiarities, or we caſt them away. Even the truth may be held in unrighteouſneſs. *Daniel's* God was undoubtedly the *true God;* but I do not conceive *Darius* any more the real friend of that *God*, when he made a decree that *all* people ſhould worſhip him, than he was when he made the decree, that no petition ſhould be aſked of any God or man, for thirty days, ſave of himſelf. The cauſe of truth wants nothing in its ſervice but the fruits of the Spirit, which are love, joy, peace, gentleneſs, goodneſs, faith, meekneſs, and temperance. All the diviſions and ſubdiviſions which now exiſt among chriſtians, or ever have exiſted, were cauſed wholly for want of thoſe graces. Should we be tenacious about certain ſentiments and peculiarities of faith, the time is not far diſtant, when univerſaliſts, who have ſuf-

fered every kind of contemptuous treatment, from the enemies of the doctrine, will be at war among themselves, and be trodden under foot of the Gentiles. Having begun in the Spirit, do not think to be made perfect by the flesh. In order to imitate our Savior, let us, like him, have compassion on the ignorant and those whom we believe to be out of the way. Attend to the exhortation, "Let brotherly love continue." If we agree in brotherly love, there is no disagreement that can do us any injury; but if we do not, no other agreement can do us any good. Let us keep a strict guard against the enemy "that sows discord among brethren." Let us endeavor to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." May charity, that heaven-born companion of the human heart, never forsake us; and may the promise of the Savior be fulfilled concerning us, "Lo I am with you even unto the end of the world."

You have now, kind reader, cast your eye over these pages; perhaps you feel to say, 'the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness cannot be true, notwithstanding all the author has said in favor of it;' and if so, I condemn you not. The time has been, when I believed as little of the doctrine as you now do; I never adopted the belief of universal holiness and happiness

out of *choice*, but from the *force* of *real* or *supposed evidence*. And I know you cannot believe it on any other ground. I hope, however, you feel no enmity to so glorious a system of God's grace; I hope you have the spirit of Christ, and wish well to mankind. I have, besure, great consolation in believing that my Redeemer has many faithful servants and loving disciples in the world, who do not believe in the extensiveness of salvation as I do, and I often take great satisfaction, in feasts of charity, with such brethren. St. Peter was undoubtedly a lover of Christ and his gospel, before he was taught by the sea of Joppa to call no man common or unclean. The rest of the disciples, who were dissatisfied with his preaching the gospel to the uncircumcised, were doubtless possessed of the spirit of Christ, which caused them to glorify God when they had more extensive views of the gospel, through Peter's communications. As far as I see men walk in the spirit of love to God and one another, I feel an union with them, whether their particular sentiments are mine, or not. / Men cannot believe at will; we believe, as evidence appears to our mind. / The times have been, when each denomination has been proscribed, and, in some measure, persecuted. Each as it rose has been censured by those who

could not fall in with their doctrine ; and what does all this condemning one another prove, only the imperfections of all, and the badneſs of the human heart ? You will not think evil of me, kind reader, if I exhort you not to feel too hard againſt what you may find to be your duty to acknowledge. It grieved Peter, when his Lord aſked him the third time, if he loved him, as he had denied him thrice. There are many univerſaliſts now who have frequent occaſion to confeſs how hard they have been againſt the doctrine, and how much they have ſpoken unadviſedly with their lips againſt what they now rejoice to believe is truth, and humbly adore the Savior of ſinners for opening their eyes to behold ſuch unſpeakable beauties. If you attend to the exhortation, to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, undoubtedly you may ſee more of the riches of his goodneſs than you now do. The prophet Ezekiel's knowledge of the holy waters was progreſſive, and obtained by degrees : When he was firſt led into the waters, they were only to his ancles ; but he went ſtill further, and they were to his knees ; he went ſtill further, and they were to his loins ; he went further, and the waters were *risen*, waters for men to ſwim in, a *river* that no man could paſs. Had the prophet refuſed to travel

in theſe waters, after he firſt entered them, he would not have known nor believed them to be ſo multitudinous as they were. A ſoul, in the earlieſt moments of heavenly love, is firſt unſpeakably charmed with the untold beauties and graces of his Redeemer; next, wife, children, father, mother, brothers, ſiſters, all friends, directly enemies, and finally all mankind are embraced in the extended arms of heavenly love and divine benevolence.

I cloſe this work, humbly hoping and expecting the glorious increaſe and extenſive growth of what I have, (though feebly) contended for, viz. the holineſs and happineſs of mankind. I look, with ſtrong expectation, for that period, when all ſin, and every degree of unreconciliation will be deſtroyed, by the divine power of that love which is ſtronger than death, which many waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown; in which alone I put my truſt, and in which my hope is anchored for all mankind; earneſtly praying, that the deſire of the righteous may not be cut off.

The fulneſs of times will come, and the times of the reſtitution of all things will be accompliſhed. Then ſhall truth be victorious, and all error flee to eternal night. Then ſhall univerſal ſongs of honor be ſung to the praiſe of him who liveth for-

ever and ever. All death, ſorrow and crying, ſhall be done away; pains and diſorders ſhall be no more felt, temptations no more trouble the lovers of God, nor ſin poiſon the human heart. The bleſſed hand of the once crucified ſhall wipe tears from off all faces. O, tranſporting thought! Then ſhall the bleſſed Savior ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and be ſatisfied, when, through his mediation, univerſal nature ſhall be brought in perfect union with truth and holineſs, and the ſpirit of God fills all rational beings. Then ſhall the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, which maketh free from the law of ſin, become the governing principle of the whole man once made ſubject to vanity, once enthraled in darkneſs, ſin and miſery; but then, delivered from the bondage of corruption, and reſtored to perfect reconciliation to God, in the heavenly Adam. Then ſhall the great object of the Savior's miſſion be accompliſhed. Then ſhall the queſtion be aſked, O death, where is thy ſting? But death ſhall not be, to give the anſwer. And, O grave, where is thy victory? But the boaſter ſhall be ſilent. The Son ſhall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father; the eternal radiance ſhall *ſmile*, and GOD *ſhall be* ALL *in* ALL.

FINIS.

List of Subscribers.

ARLINGTON, *Vt.*

Solomon Mills.

BENNINGTON, *Vt.*

Lucius H Gibbs,
Daniel Griswold,
Joseph Hinsdill,
Jonas Haynes, jun.
Lemuel Leach,
James Law,
Sylvanus Rutenbur,
Benjamin O Tyler,
Chester Walbridge,
James Walling.

GUILFORD, *Vt.*

Liberty Goodnow

POWNAL, *Vt.*

Moody Ames,
Willard Bates,
Josiah Bennett,
Samuel Bliss,
Jonathan Brown,
Elijah Curtis,
Sylvanus Danforth,
Obadiah Dunham,
Benjamin Gardner,
Daniel Gardner,
Benjamin Gardner, 2d.
Henry Gardner, 2.
Noel Gardner,
Rhodes Gardner,
Caleb Gibbs,
Anson Gibbs,
William Hall,
Zacheus Hovey,
Stephen Merchant,
John Moar,
William Nobles,
James Parker,
G—— P——,
Ichabod Paddock,
James Perkins,
Caleb Potter,
Jerediah Purdy,
Heman Scranton,
Thomas Stephens,
Abraham Vosburgh,
John F. Waterhouse,
Angel Whipple,
Josiah Wright,
Solomon Wright,
Samuel Wright.

SHAFTSBURY, *Vt.*

Elijah Bump,
James Corning,
Elihu Cross,
Samuel Cross,
John Fuller,
Gamaliel Willington,
Samuel Willington, 2
Benajah Stanley,
Moses Stanley,
James Sweet,

CAMBRIDGE, *N. Y.*

John Cooper,
Moses Caldwell.
David Chase,
Reuben Stewart,
Charles Sayles,

HOSICK, *N. Y.*

Beverly Chase,
William Edmunds,
Allen Faxon,
Henry Johnson,
Amos Marsh,
Anthony Van Suydam.

PETERSBURG, *N. Y.*

Joel A. Burdick,
Daniel Gardner,
Abraham Lewis,
Nathan Main, jun.
Allen Newell,

WILLIAMSTOWN, *Mass.*

Samuel Duncan,
Daniel M'Intosh,
Nathan B. Town,

WESTMORELAND, *N. H.*

Azel Welbore,